



**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL**

TAXATION DIVISION

**COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
CASE LIST AND SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

March 2005

Table of Contents

Table of Cases	ix
Franchise Tax	1
Anderson-Clayton Bros. Funeral Home, Inc.; Restland of Dallas, Inc.; Restland Funeral Home; Singing Hills Funeral Homes, Inc.; Laurel Land Funeral Home of Fort Worth, Inc.; Blue Bonnet Hills Funeral Home, Inc.; and Blue Bonnet Hills Memorial Park, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	1
CTX Mortgage Co., LLC, as Successor in Interest to CTX Mortgage Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	2
Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	2
Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	3
Centex International, Inc., as Successor in Interest to 2728 Holding Corp., as Successor in Interest to Centex Real Estate Corp. v Strayhorn, et al.	3
Centex Materials, L.P., As Successor in Interest to Centex Materials, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	4
Central Telephone Co. of Texas and United Telephone Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al.	4
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	5
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	5
DaimlerChrysler Services North American, LLC	6
Dillard Department Stores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	6
El Paso Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	7
El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	7
First Co. v. Rylander, et al.	8
Home Interiors & Gifts, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	8
Inland Truck Parts Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	9
INOVA Diagnostics, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	9
Kellwood Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	10
Randall's Food & Drugs, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	10
Reliant Energy Corp. (formerly Houston Industries, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al.	11
Reliant Energy Gas Transmission Co., fka Noram Gas Transmission Co. v. Rylander, et al.	11
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. v. Rylander, et al.	11
Strattec Security Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	12
TGS-NOPEC Geophysical Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	12
Texaco Refining & Marketing (East), Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	13

	Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	13
	Viacom International, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	13
Sales Tax		15
	7-Eleven, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	15
	AccuTel of Texas, L.P. v. Rylander, et al.	15
	Advanta Business Services Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	15
	Alpine Industries, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	16
	Amerada Hess Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	16
	American Oil Change Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	17
	Anderson Merchandisers Holding, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	17
	Apollo Paint & Body Shop, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	18
	Aramis Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	18
	Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	18
	B&B Gravel Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	19
	BGK Operating Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	19
	Baldry, Ann dba Annie's Housekeeping Services v. Sharp, et al.	20
	Bell Bottom Foundation Co. v. Rylander, et al.	20
	Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	20
	Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	21
	Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Texas, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	21
	Boeing North America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	22
	Boeing North America, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	22
	Bonart, Richard C., DVM v. Strayhorn, et al.	23
	Broadcast Satellite International, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	23
	C & T Stone Co. v. Rylander, et al.	23
	Central Power & Light Co. v. Sharp, et al.	24
	Chapal Zenray, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	24
	Chevron Pipe Line Co. and West Texas Gulf Pipe Line Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	25
	Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	25
	Church & Dwight Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	26
	Clinique Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	26
	Clinique Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	26
	Clinique Services, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	27
	Coastal Refining & Marketing, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	27
	Cosmair, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	28
	Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	28
	Dillard's, Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Rylander, et al.	29
	Dillard's Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al.	29

DuPont Photomasks, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	30
EFW, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	30
ELC Beauty LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	31
ELC Beauty, LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Origins Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	31
ELC Beauty, LLC, as a Successor-in-Interest to Estee Lauder Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	32
E. de la Garza, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	32
Ebrahim, Suleiman S. v. Strayhorn, et al.	33
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	33
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	33
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	34
Ethicon, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	34
F M Express Food Mart, Inc., and Fouad Hanna Mekdessi v. Rylander, et al.	34
FXI Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	35
Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. v. Sharp, et al.	35
Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. and San Antonio Theme Park, L.P. v. Rylander, et al.	36
Garza, Lawrence v. Sharp, et al.	36
General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	37
General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	37
Gift Box Corp. of America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	37
Graybar Electric Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	38
Grocers Supply-Institutional-Convenience, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	38
H.J. Wilson Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	39
Herndon Marine Products, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	39
Hollon Oil Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	39
Houston Wire & Cable Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	40
JBI, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	40
JBS Packing Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	41
J.C. Penney Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	41
Jerman Cookie Co. v. Rylander, et al.	41
Kennedy, Gary G. dba Kennedy's Korner v. Rylander, et al.	42
Kroger Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	42
LTV Aerospace & Defense Co. v. Rylander, et al.	43
Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	43
Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	44
Laredo Country Club, Inc., A Texas Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	44

Laredo Pizza, Inc., and Samuel L. Alford, and L & H Pacific, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al.	44
Lee Construction and Maintenance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	45
Levy, Tara, et al. v. OfficeMax, Inc. and Best Buy Stores, L.P.	45
Liaison Resources, L.P., and David S. Claunch v. Rylander, et al.	46
Local Neon Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	46
Lockheed Martin Corp., as Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. and Loral Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	47
Lockheed Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	47
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	48
Lockheed Martin Corp., Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	48
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	49
Lockheed Martin Kelly Aviation Center, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	49
MG Building Materials, Ltd. v. Strayhorn, et al.	50
Mars, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	50
Maxus Energy Corp. as Successor in Interest to Maxus Corporate Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	51
Medaphis Physicians Services Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	51
Mitchell, Christia Parr v. Rylander, et al.	52
Nachhattar Tejpal Legha Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	52
Neiman Marcus Group, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	52
Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., The v. Rylander, et al.	53
North American Intelcom, Inc., et al. v. Sharp, et al.	53
North Texas Asset Management, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	54
Northrop Grumman Systems Corp. (Successor to Northrop Grumman Corp. and Vought Aircraft Co.) v. Rylander, et al.	54
Petrolite Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	55
R.H. Salas & Associates, Inc. v. Comptroller	55
Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	55
Raytheon Co., as Successor in Interest to Raytheon Training, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	56
Raytheon Co. and Daimlerchrysler Corp. as Successors to Central Texas Airborne Systems, Inc., fka Chrysler Technologies Airborne Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	57
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon TI Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	57
Raytheon Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	58
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	58
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	59
Reynolds Metals Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	59
Roadway Express, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	60

Robbins & Myers, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	60
Rockwell Collins, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	61
Rollins & Rollins Enterprises, Inc. , dba Country Kwik Stop v. Rylander, et al.	61
Sabine Mining Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	61
San Antonio Spurs, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al.	62
Schoenborn & Doll Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	62
Service Merchandise Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	63
Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	63
Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	64
Southern Sandblasting and Coatings, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	64
Southwest Food Processing & Refrigerated Services, aka Southwest Refrigerated Warehousing Services v. Rylander, et al.	65
Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al.	65
Sprint International Communications, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	66
Steamatic of Austin, Inc., et al. v. Rylander, et al.	66
Summit Photographix, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	67
Sysco Food Services of Austin, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	67
Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Service of Houston, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al.	68
Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Services of Houston, Inc.) v. Strayhorn, et al.	68
TCCT Real Estate, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	68
TCCT Real Estate, Inc. as Successor to TCC Austin Industrial Overhead v. Rylander, et al.	69
TDI-Halter, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	69
Telecable Associates, Inc.; Teleservice Corp. of America; Texas Telecable, Inc.; TCA Cable of Amarillo, Inc.; and Texas Community Antennas, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	70
Texaco, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	70
Texas Gulf, Inc. v. Bullock, et al.	71
Union Carbide Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	71
United Space Alliance, LLC v. Strayhorn, et al.	71
Val-Pak Franchise Operations, Inc. dba Valpak of Houston v. Strayhorn, et al.	72
West Texas Pizza, Limited Partnership v. Sharp, et al.	72
White Swan, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	73
Williams, Duane Everett v. Comptroller	73
World Fitness Centers, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	73
Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	74
Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	74

	Zimmerman Sign Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	75
Insurance Tax	77
	Allstate County Mutual Insurance Co.; Allstate Insurance Co.; Allstate Indemnity Co.; Allstate Texas Lloyds; and Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	77
	American Bankers Insurance Co. of Florida, et al. v. Ann Richards, et al.	77
	American Fidelity Assurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	78
	American International Specialty Lines Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	78
	Fireman’s Fund Insurance Co. of Ohio v. Rylander, et al.	79
	First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	79
	First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	80
	Lexington Insurance Co., Landmark Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	80
	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al.	81
	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al.	81
	Old Republic National Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	82
	Old Republic Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	82
	STP Nuclear Operating Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	83
	St. Paul Surplus Lines Co. v. Rylander, et al.	83
	Universe Life Insurance Co. v. State of Texas	84
	Universe Life Insurance Co., The v. Cornyn, et al.	84
	Warranty Underwriters Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	85
Other Taxes	87
	Alpine ISD v. Strayhorn	87
	Armelin, John M. v. City of Houston	87
	Arnold, Jessamine J., Estate of, Deceased, and Jim Arnold, Jr., Independent Executor v. Rylander, et al.	87
	Beadles, Joe Haven v. Comptroller	88
	CarMax Auto Superstores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	88
	Castleberry ISD; Ennis ISD; Canyon ISD; La Porte ISD v. Comptroller	89
	Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	89
	Comfort ISD v. Comptroller	89
	Commerce ISD v. Comptroller	90
	ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	90
	ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	91
	Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, et al. v. Troy G. Rountree, et al.	91
	El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Sharp	91
	Fort Worth’s PR’s, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	92
	Gilani, Fred v. Progressive Amusement, Inc., Craig Byler and Comptroller	92
	Glen Rose ISD v. Comptroller	93
	Greenville ISD v. Comptroller	93
	Harris County, et al. v. John W. Adams, et al.	93

Lake Austin Spa Investors, Ltd. v. Rylander, et al.	94
MFC Finance Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al.	94
Marathon ISD v. Strayhorn	95
McLane Co., Inc. and McLane Foodservice-Lubbock, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	95
Mirage Real Estate, Inc., et al. v. Richard Durbin, et al.	96
Petro Express Management, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al.	96
Preston Motors by George L. Preston, Owner v. Sharp, et al.	96
Quinlan ISD v. Strayhorn	97
Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al.	97
Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, Inc., L.L.C. v. Alon USA, LP	97
Robinson, Barbara Cooke, Estate of v. Strayhorn, et al.	98
San Vicente ISD v. Strayhorn	98
State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	98
Texaco Exploration & Production, Inc.	99
Texas RSA 15B2 Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al.	99
That's Entertainment - San Antonio, LLC dba Park Place v. Strayhorn, et al.	100
Willow Creek Resources, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	100
Yantis ISD v. Comptroller	101
Closed Cases	103
Chaparral Steel Co. and Chaparral Steel Midlothian, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al.	103
LabOne, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	103
May Department Stores Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	104
RAI Credit Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	104
Security National Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	105
Southern Union Co. v. Rylander, et al.	105
Terlingua Common ISD v. Comptroller	106
Index	107

Table of Cases

7-Eleven, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	15
AccuTel of Texas, L.P. v. Rylander, et al.	15
Advanta Business Services Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	15
Allstate County Mutual Insurance Co.; Allstate Insurance Co.; Allstate Indemnity Co.; Allstate Texas Lloyds; and Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	77
Alpine Industries, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	16
Alpine ISD v. Strayhorn	87
Amerada Hess Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	16
American Bankers Insurance Co. of Florida, et al. v. Ann Richards, et al.	77
American Fidelity Assurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	78
American International Specialty Lines Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	78
American Oil Change Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	17
Anderson Merchandisers Holding, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	17
Anderson-Clayton Bros. Funeral Home, Inc.; Restland of Dallas, Inc.; Restland Funeral Home; Singing Hills Funeral Homes, Inc.; Laurel Land Funeral Home of Fort Worth, Inc.; Blue Bonnet Hills Funeral Home, Inc.; and Blue Bonnet Hills Memorial Park, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	1
Apollo Paint & Body Shop, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	18
Aramis Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	18
Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	18
Armelin, John M. v. City of Houston	87
Arnold, Jessamine J., Estate of, Deceased, and Jim Arnold, Jr., Independent Executor v. Rylander, et al.	87
B&B Gravel Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	19
BGK Operating Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	19
Baldry, Ann dba Annie's Housekeeping Services v. Sharp, et al.	20
Beadles, Joe Haven v. Comptroller	88
Bell Bottom Foundation Co. v. Rylander, et al.	20
Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	21
Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	20
Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Texas, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	21
Boeing North America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	22
Boeing North America, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	22
Bonart, Richard C., DVM v. Strayhorn, et al.	23
Broadcast Satellite International, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	23
C & T Stone Co. v. Rylander, et al.	23
CTX Mortgage Co., LLC, as Successor in Interest to CTX Mortgage Co., Inc. v.	

Strayhorn, et al.	2
CarMax Auto Superstores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	88
Castleberry ISD; Ennis ISD; Canyon ISD; La Porte ISD v. Comptroller	89
Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	3
Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	2
Centex International, Inc., as Successor in Interest to 2728 Holding Corp., as Successor in Interest to Centex Real Estate Corp. v Strayhorn, et al.	3
Centex Materials, L.P., As Successor in Interest to Centex Materials, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	4
Central Power & Light Co. v. Sharp, et al.	24
Central Telephone Co. of Texas and United Telephone Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al.	4
Chapal Zenray, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	24
Chaparral Steel Co. and Chaparral Steel Midlothian, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al.	103
Chevron Pipe Line Co. and West Texas Gulf Pipe Line Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	25
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	5
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	89
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	5
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	25
Church & Dwight Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	26
Clinique Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	26
Clinique Services, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	27
Clinique Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	26
Coastal Refining & Marketing, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	27
Comfort ISD v. Comptroller	89
Commerce ISD v. Comptroller	90
ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	91
ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	90
Cosmair, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	28
Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, et al. v. Troy G. Rountree, et al.	91
DaimlerChrysler Services North American, LLC	6
Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	28
Dillard Department Stores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	6
Dillard's Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al.	29
Dillard's, Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Rylander, et al.	29
DuPont Photomasks, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	30
E. de la Garza, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	32
Ebrahim, Suleiman S. v. Strayhorn, et al.	33
EFW, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	30

ELC Beauty, LLC, as a Successor-in-Interest to Estee Lauder Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	32
ELC Beauty LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	31
ELC Beauty, LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Origins Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	31
El Paso Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	7
El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	7
El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Sharp	91
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	33
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	34
Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	33
Ethicon, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	34
F M Express Food Mart, Inc., and Fouad Hanna Mekdessi v. Rylander, et al.	34
FXI Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	35
Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. and San Antonio Theme Park, L.P. v. Rylander, et al.	36
Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. v. Sharp, et al.	35
Fireman’s Fund Insurance Co. of Ohio v. Rylander, et al.	79
First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	80
First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	79
First Co. v. Rylander, et al.	8
Fort Worth’s PR’s, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	92
Garza, Lawrence v. Sharp, et al.	36
General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	37
General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	37
Gift Box Corp. of America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	37
Gilani, Fred v. Progressive Amusement, Inc., Craig Byler and Comptroller	92
Glen Rose ISD v. Comptroller	93
Graybar Electric Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	38
Greenville ISD v. Comptroller	93
Grocers Supply-Institutional-Convenience, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	38
H.J. Wilson Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	39
Harris County, et al. v. John W. Adams, et al.	93
Herndon Marine Products, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	39
Hollon Oil Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	39
Home Interiors & Gifts, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	8
Houston Wire & Cable Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	40
Inland Truck Parts Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	9
INOVA Diagnostics, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	9
J.C. Penney Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	41
JB I, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	40
JBS Packing Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	41
Jerman Cookie Co. v. Rylander, et al.	41

Kellwood Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	10
Kennedy, Gary G. dba Kennedy's Korner v. Rylander, et al.	42
Kroger Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	42
LTV Aerospace & Defense Co. v. Rylander, et al.	43
LabOne, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	103
Lake Austin Spa Investors, Ltd. v. Rylander, et al.	94
Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	43
Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	44
Laredo Country Club, Inc., A Texas Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	44
Laredo Pizza, Inc., and Samuel L. Alford, and L & H Pacific, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al.	44
Lee Construction and Maintenance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	45
Levy, Tara, et al. v. OfficeMax, Inc. and Best Buy Stores, L.P.	45
Lexington Insurance Co., Landmark Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	80
Liaison Resources, L.P., and David S. Claunch v. Rylander, et al.	46
Local Neon Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	46
Lockheed Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	47
Lockheed Martin Corp., as Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. and Loral Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	47
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	49
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	48
Lockheed Martin Corp., Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	48
Lockheed Martin Kelly Aviation Center, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	49
MFC Finance Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al.	94
MG Building Materials, Ltd. v. Strayhorn, et al.	50
Marathon ISD v. Strayhorn	95
Mars, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	50
Maxus Energy Corp. as Successor in Interest to Maxus Corporate Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	51
May Department Stores Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	104
McLane Co., Inc. and McLane Foodservice-Lubbock, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	95
Medaphis Physicians Services Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	51
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al.	81
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al.	81
Mirage Real Estate, Inc., et al. v. Richard Durbin, et al.	96
Mitchell, Christia Parr v. Rylander, et al.	52
Nachhattar Tejpal Legha Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	52
Neiman Marcus Group, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	52
Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., The v. Rylander, et al.	53
North American Intelcom, Inc., et al. v. Sharp, et al.	53
North Texas Asset Management, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	54
Northrop Grumman Systems Corp. (Successor to Northrop Grumman Corp. and Vought	

Aircraft Co.) v. Rylander, et al.	54
Old Republic National Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	82
Old Republic Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	82
Petro Express Management, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al.	96
Petrolite Corp. v. Sharp, et al.	55
Preston Motors by George L. Preston, Owner v. Sharp, et al.	96
Quinlan ISD v. Strayhorn	97
R.H. Salas & Associates, Inc. v. Comptroller	55
RAI Credit Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	104
Randall's Food & Drugs, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	10
Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, Inc., L.L.C. v. Alon USA, LP	97
Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al.	97
Raytheon Co. and Daimlerchrysler Corp. as Successors to Central Texas Airborne Systems, Inc., fka Chrysler Technologies Airborne Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	57
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon TI Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	57
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	59
Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	58
Raytheon Co., as Successor in Interest to Raytheon Training, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	56
Raytheon Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	58
Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	55
Reliant Energy Corp. (formerly Houston Industries, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al.	11
Reliant Energy Gas Transmission Co., fka Noram Gas Transmission Co. v. Rylander, et al.	11
Reynolds Metals Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	59
Roadway Express, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	60
Robbins & Myers, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	60
Robinson, Barbara Cooke, Estate of v. Strayhorn, et al.	98
Rockwell Collins, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	61
Rollins & Rollins Enterprises, Inc. , dba Country Kwik Stop v. Rylander, et al.	61
STP Nuclear Operating Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	83
Sabine Mining Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al.	61
San Antonio Spurs, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al.	62
San Vicente ISD v. Strayhorn	98
Schoenborn & Doll Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	62
Security National Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	105
Service Merchandise Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	63
Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	63
Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	64
Southern Sandblasting and Coatings, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	64
Southern Union Co. v. Rylander, et al.	105
Southwest Food Processing & Refrigerated Services, aka Southwest Refrigerated Warehousing Services v. Rylander, et al.	65

Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al.	65
Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. v. Rylander, et al.	11
Sprint International Communications, Inc. v. Sharp, et al.	66
St. Paul Surplus Lines Co. v. Rylander, et al.	83
State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	98
Steamatic of Austin, Inc., et al. v. Rylander, et al.	66
Strattec Security Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al.	12
Summit Photographix, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	67
Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Services of Houston, Inc.) v. Strayhorn, et al.	68
Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Service of Houston, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al.	68
Sysco Food Services of Austin, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	67
TCCT Real Estate, Inc. as Successor to TCC Austin Industrial Overhead v. Rylander, et al.	69
TCCT Real Estate, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	68
TDI-Halter, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	69
TGS-NOPEC Geophysical Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	12
Telecable Associates, Inc.; Teleservice Corp. of America; Texas Telecable, Inc.; TCA Cable of Amarillo, Inc.; and Texas Community Antennas, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	70
Terlingua Common ISD v. Comptroller	106
Texaco Exploration & Production, Inc.	99
Texaco, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	70
Texaco Refining & Marketing (East), Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	13
Texas Gulf, Inc. v. Bullock, et al.	71
Texas RSA 15B2 Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al.	99
That's Entertainment - San Antonio, LLC dba Park Place v. Strayhorn, et al.	100
Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	13
Union Carbide Corp. v. Rylander, et al.	71
United Space Alliance, LLC v. Strayhorn, et al.	71
Universe Life Insurance Co., The v. Cornyn, et al.	84
Universe Life Insurance Co. v. State of Texas	84
Val-Pak Franchise Operations, Inc. dba Valpak of Houston v. Strayhorn, et al.	72
Viacom International, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	13
Warranty Underwriters Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.	85
West Texas Pizza, Limited Partnership v. Sharp, et al.	72
White Swan, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	73
Williams, Duane Everett v. Comptroller	73
Willow Creek Resources, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	100
World Fitness Centers, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	73
Yantis ISD v. Comptroller	101

Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.	74
Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.	74
Zimmerman Sign Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.	75

Franchise Tax

Anderson-Clayton Bros. Funeral Home, Inc.; Restland of Dallas, Inc.; Restland Funeral Home; Singing Hills Funeral Homes, Inc.; Laurel Land Funeral Home of Fort Worth, Inc.; Blue Bonnet Hills Funeral Home, Inc.; and Blue Bonnet Hills Memorial Park, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-12183

#03-03-00458-CV

#05-0063

AG Case #991227646

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 10/18/99

Period: 1993-1996

Amount: \$407,212.91

\$107,861.97

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Jan Soifer

Brim, Arnett, Soifer,

Robinett, Hanner &

Connors

Austin

Susan A. Kidwell

Locke, Liddell & Sapp

Austin

Issue: Whether income earned on Plaintiff's trust accounts for prepaid funeral services gives rise to Texas gross receipts.

Status: Motion for Summary Judgment held 04/10/03; granted in favor of the State 06/24/03. Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal filed 07/31/03. Appellants' brief filed 09/18/03. Appellees' brief filed 10/24/03. Appellants' reply brief filed 11/12/03. Oral Argument completed 01/07/04. Appellees' post-submission brief filed 01/22/04. Appellants' reply brief filed 02/06/04. Opinion issued 08/12/04 in favor of State affirming the district court's judgment. Motion for Rehearing filed 10/01/04; overruled 12/09/04. Petition for Review filed in Texas Supreme Court 01/24/05. Respondents filed waiver to respond 02/02/05. Case forwarded to Court 02/08/05.

CTX Mortgage Co., LLC, as Successor in Interest to CTX Mortgage Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300145

AG Case #031738131

Franchise Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 01/15/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 1992-1994		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$6,482.90		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether application of the requirement of documentation that officers do not participate in significant policy-making aspects of the corporation is retroactive and unconstitutional. Whether different treatment of banks and mortgage companies violates equal protection. Whether Plaintiff's vice presidents and others should not be included in the officer add-back provision of the franchise tax. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301292

AG Case #031787153

Franchise Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 04/23/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 1992-1995		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$191,167.76		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's add-back of compensation to certain officers and directors included persons who lacked significant policy-making authority and was unconstitutional. Whether the Comptroller improperly applied changes in Rule 3.558 to earlier periods. Whether the officer add-back is arbitrary and discriminatory. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Centex Construction Co., Inc., as Successor in Interest to Centex Bateson Construction Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301293
AG Case #031787161

Franchise Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 04/23/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 1996		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$48,729.67		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's add-back of compensation to certain officers and directors included persons who lacked significant policy-making authority and was unconstitutional. Whether the Comptroller improperly applied changes in Rule 3.558 to earlier periods. Whether the officer add-back is arbitrary and discriminatory. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Centex International, Inc., as Successor in Interest to 2728 Holding Corp., as Successor in Interest to Centex Real Estate Corp. v Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400903
AG Case #041941147

Franchise Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 03/17/04	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 1992-1995		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$634,494.07		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's add-back of compensation to certain officers and directors included persons who lacked significant policy-making authority and was unconstitutional. Whether the Comptroller improperly applied changes in Rule 3.558 to earlier periods. Whether the officer add-back is arbitrary and discriminatory. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Centex Materials, L.P., As Successor in Interest to Centex Materials, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301277
AG Case #031787146

Franchise Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 04/22/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 1997-2000		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$96,248.92		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's add-back of compensation to certain officers and directors included persons who lacked significant policy-making authority and was unconstitutional. Whether the Comptroller improperly applied changes in Rule 3.558 to earlier periods. Whether the officer add-back is arbitrary and discriminatory. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Central Telephone Co. of Texas and United Telephone Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN100332
AG Case #011409646

Franchise Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 02/01/01		
Period: 1988-1994	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Amount: \$300,772.95		Ray Langenberg
\$204,616.25		Scott, Douglass & McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether inclusion of access charges in Texas' gross receipts violates Comptroller rules on franchise tax treatment of interstate telephone receipts. Whether inclusion of the charges violates equal protection.

Status: Answer filed.

Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401579
AG Case #041972456

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 05/17/04

Period: 1987-1999

Amount: \$44,063,913.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
R. Eric Hagenswold
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff may compute surplus using an alternative GAAP method of calculating impairment. Whether Plaintiff may use business loss carry-forward as a deduction to taxable earned surplus. Whether the Comptroller incorrectly calculated Plaintiff's pushdown adjustments. Whether environmental reserves should be calculated as taxable capital surplus. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to the manufacturing credit.

Status: Answer filed.

Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500170
AG Case #052091378

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 01/18/05

Period: 1988-1991,
1995, 1996 and 1999

Amount: \$5,000,000.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether abandonment costs of oil and gas properties can be excluded from surplus as contra-asset accounts for depreciation, depletion and amortization under GAAP guidelines. Whether Plaintiff may change its accounting methods used to compute surplus within a four year period. Plaintiff also claims violation of equal and uniform taxation and equal protection.

Status: Discovery in progress.

DaimlerChrysler Services North American, LLC Cause #GN401380
AG Case #041965591

Franchise Tax; Refund Filed: 04/30/04 Period: 1988 through 1991 Amount: \$2,123,382.74	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Matthew J. Meese Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: How should proceeds from the sale of accounts receivables, including retail and wholesale, be calculated for franchise tax apportionment purposes. Whether plaintiff's accounts receivables are capital assets or investments. Plaintiff claims that the Comptroller's use of the net gain method instead of the gross receipts method in calculating plaintiff's total gross receipts for franchise tax apportionment purposes violates the Texas Tax Code, the Comptroller's rules, Comptroller policy, and the constitutional requirements of equal protection and equal and uniform taxation.

Status: Answer filed.

Dillard Department Stores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300878
AG Case #031770621

Franchise Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 03/19/03 Period: 1992-1995 Amount: \$1,646,637	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Cynthia M. Ohlenforst Tracy D. Eaton Dallas
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the franchise tax requirement to add back officer and director compensation to the tax base is an unconstitutional tax on the income of natural persons. Whether the shareholder limit for the add-back is arbitrary, unreasonable and discriminatory. Whether the provision also discriminates unconstitutionally between banks and other corporations and should be limited to officers with significant authority.

Status: Answer filed.

El Paso Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304213

AG Case #031879356

Franchise Tax; Protest

Filed: 10/28/03

Period: 1999 - 2001

Amount: \$2,278,308.75

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether severance pay and merger expenses were improperly included in Plaintiff's apportionment factor. Whether other income was improperly sourced or included. Whether certain deductions were erroneously disallowed. Plaintiff also seeks waiver of all penalty and interest.

Status: Answer filed.

El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301003

AG Case #031778939

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 03/28/03

Period: 1989-1991

Amount: \$3,000,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff may use the successful efforts method of accounting. Whether revenue should be recognized when it is billed rather than when it is booked. Whether unamortized loss on reacquired debt may be expensed. Whether certain accounts should be removed from surplus because they had zero balances. Whether Plaintiff's apportionment factor should be reduced for receipts from gas not picked up or delivered in Texas.

Status: Discovery in progress. Summary Judgment hearing held 08/24/04; taken under advisement. Both motions granted in part and denied in part. Judgment entered 02/24/05. Notice of Appeal due 03/28/05.

First Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200229

AG Case #021556980

Franchise Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 01/24/02

Period: 1996 through
1999

Amount: \$1,919,109

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

James F. Martens
Christina A. Mondrik
James F. Martens &
Associates
Austin

Issue: Whether the throwback rule is unconstitutional and violates P.L. 86-272. Whether apportionment under the throwback rule, when compared to a separate accounting method, creates such a gross disparity in taxable income as to be unconstitutional. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory judgment and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery suspended.

Home Interiors & Gifts, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN303185

#03-04-00660-CV

AG Case #031842420

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 08/25/03

Period: 1992-1999

Amount: \$16,085,391.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Daniel L. Butcher
Strasburger & Price
Dallas

Farley P. Katz
Strasburger & Price
San Antonio

Issue: Whether the Texas throwback provision, Tax Code §171.1032, is unconstitutional in violation of the Due Process, Commerce, Supremacy, and Equal Protection Clauses.

Status: Hearing on Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment held 09/21/04. Court granted Defendants' MSJ 09/30/04. Notice of Appeal filed 10/20/04. Clerk's Record filed 11/22/04. Appellant's brief filed 01/24/05; Oral Argument requested. Supplemental Clerk's Record filed 02/11/05. Appellees' brief due 03/11/05.

Inland Truck Parts Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302603

AG Case #031831746

Franchise Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 07/24/03

Period: 1999

Amount: \$47,775.25

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Cynthia M. Ohlenforst

G. James Landon

J. Blake Rice

Hughes & Luce

Dallas

Issue: Whether an S corporation owned by an ESOP owes franchise tax when the shareholder has no income reportable to the IRS as taxable.

Status: Answer filed.

INOVA Diagnostics, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302862

#03-04-00503-CV

AG Case #031836471

Franchise Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 08/11/03

Period: 1999 through
2003

Amount: \$4,658

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christine Monzingo

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.

Stahl, Bernal & Davies

Austin

Issue: Whether taxpayer has nexus with Texas. Whether the capital- based franchise tax is measured by net income for purposes of P.L. 86-272. Whether the Comptroller wrongfully forfeited plaintiff's corporate privileges. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Non-jury trial held 07/13/04 and Judgment granted for State. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law filed 07/21/04. Notice of Appeal filed 08/16/04. Clerk's Record filed 11/05/04. Appellant's brief filed 12/29/04. Appellees' brief filed 02/16/05. Oral Argument requested. Appellant's unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief filed 03/01/05.

Kellwood Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500508
AG Case #052102654

Franchise Tax; Protest
Filed: 02/16/05
Period: 2001-2003
Amount: \$129,355.44

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jeff Mullins

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Ira A. Lipstet
Jason Flaherty
Jenkins & Gilchrist
Austin

Issue: How should pension reversion gain be allocated for franchise tax apportionment purposes. Is the pension reversion gain non-unitary or unitary earned surplus income. Whether Plaintiff's pension reversion gain should be calculated with Plaintiff's Texas gross receipts. What methodology the Comptroller should apply to not distort the amount of taxable earned surplus apportionable to Texas. Plaintiff also claims violation of the Due Process and Commerce Clauses of the US Constitution and the Due Course of Law provision of the Texas Constitution.

Status: Answer filed.

Randall's Food & Drugs, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN003174
AG Case #001375450

Franchise Tax; Protest
Filed: 10/31/00
Period: 1994-1997
Amount: \$4,006,942.39

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christine Monzingo

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jasper G. Taylor, III
Jay M. Chadha
Fulbright & Jaworski
Houston

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's Rule 3.555(g)(3), which denies a carry forward of business losses of a merged corporation by the surviving corporation, is an unconstitutional retroactive law or a violation of Texas and Delaware statutes on mergers. Whether compensation of officers and directors should have been added back to Plaintiff's income and whether doing so violates constitutional equal taxation requirements. Whether some receipts were incorrectly treated as Texas receipts. Whether surplus calculation by the Comptroller should have excluded increases from push-down accounting. Whether failure to waive penalties and interest was arbitrary. Whether the audit has calculation errors. Whether the Comptroller's determination and decision violate equal protection, due process, and other constitutional provisions.

Status: Non-jury trial held 12/14/04. Court granted judgment for the Comptroller on 01/19/05. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law signed.

Reliant Energy Corp. (formerly Houston Industries, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al.

Cause #GN103935

AG Case #011532348

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 11/28/01

Period: 1998

Amount: \$2,581,013.52

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloutt

L.G. Skip Smith
David H. Gilliland
Clark, Thomas & Winters
Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff may use business loss carry- forward from non-surviving corporation in merger to reduce its franchise tax.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Reliant Energy Gas Transmission Co., fka Noram Gas Transmission Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-08127

AG Case #991187675

Franchise Tax; Refund

Filed: 07/15/99

Period: 1996

Amount: \$163,758.10

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloutt

L.G. Skip Smith
David H. Gilliland
Clark, Thomas & Winters
Austin

Issue: Whether a business loss carry-forward of a merged corporation may be used to reduce the surviving corporation's franchise tax.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN204559

AG Case #031730666

Franchise Tax; Protest Filed: 12/20/02 Period: 1996-1999; 2001 Amount: \$25,000,000.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether interstate access revenues are Texas receipts for franchise tax purposes. Whether treating the revenues as Texas receipts violates the Comptroller's Rule on interstate calls and the due process, equal protection and commerce clauses of the Constitution. Whether other interstate call revenues in border areas are not Texas receipts.

Status: First Amended Original Petition adding 2001 final report filed.

Strattec Security Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401136

AG Case #041954496

Franchise Tax; Refund Filed: 04/08/04 Period: 07/03/95- 06/29/99 Amount: \$1,165,345	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether gross receipts from the sales of locksets are Texas receipts. Whether the throwback rule was applied to Plaintiff's receipts. Plaintiff claims violation of the commerce clause.

Status: Case settled.

TGS-NOPEC Geophysical Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500637
AG Case #052114220

Franchise Tax; Protest Filed: 03/01/05 Period: 1997-2000 2001-2003 Amount: \$390,471.26 1,422,008.76	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo R. Scott Wolfrom Jones, Walker, Waechter, Poitevent, Carrère & Denègre, LLP The Woodlands
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's gross receipts should be treated as receipts from intangibles apportioned based on the location of the payor or the location of the alleged use of data. Whether the transfer of seismic data is a "license" or the transfer of an intangible for franchise tax apportionment purposes. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Texaco Refining & Marketing (East), Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-14555
AG Case #991249228

Franchise Tax; Refund Filed: 12/15/99 Period: 1994 Amount: \$1,028,616.15	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a franchise tax credit for sales tax on manufacturing equipment purchased by a joint venture that it co-owned.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302279
AG Case #031818966

Franchise Tax; Refund Filed: 06/27/03 Period: 1992-1997 Amount: \$4,462,424.56	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff must use accelerated or straight line depreciation. Whether penalty and interest should have been waived because Plaintiff's affiliates had overpayments during the audit period that could have been credited to Plaintiff's deficiencies.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Viacom International, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN402433
AG Case #041999269

Franchise Tax; Protest
Filed: 07/30/04
Period: 1997-1999
Amount: \$754,178.16

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Plaintiff's Counsel:

David H. Gilliland
Clark, Thomas & Winters
Austin

Issue: Whether revenue received from third-party cable television system operators is revenue earned from licensing or from the service of producing, creating, editing, packaging and transmitting 24-hour-per day network programming performed out-of-state. Should revenue from providing these services be considered Texas receipts for franchise tax purposes. Plaintiff also claims violation of due process and the Commerce Clause.

Status: Trial set 07/25/05.

Sales Tax

7-Eleven, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403369

AG Case #042046367

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 10/08/04

Period: 04/01/93-
09/30/96

Amount: \$299,328.98

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jeff Mullins

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether the purchase of bookkeeping software installed on computers located out-of-state and subsequently shipped to stores in-state qualifies for the sale for resale exemption.

Status: Discovery in progress.

AccuTel of Texas, L.P. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN300091

AG Case #031735236

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 01/10/03

Period: 06/01/97-
11/30/00

Amount: \$45,658.15

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Natalie McLemore

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Malish
Foster & Malish
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff should have been assessed interest and penalty.

Status: Answer filed.

Advanta Business Services Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN103463

AG Case #011514544

Sales Tax; Protest

Filed: 10/19/01

Period: 11/01/92-
12/31/97

Amount: \$929,964.11

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Plaintiff's Counsel:

W. Stephen Benesh
Deanna E. King
Bracewell & Patterson
Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff's leases were financing leases and not taxable operating leases under Comptroller Rule 3.294(i). Whether the Comptroller's sample was flawed. Alternatively, whether penalty and interest should have been waived.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Alpine Industries, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-12998

#03-03-0643-CV

#04-0785

AG Case #981080526

Sales Tax; Protest

Filed: 11/20/98

Period: 1994-1998

Amount: \$31,128.62

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Blake Hawthorne

Stephen D. Good
Gregory A. Harwell
Gardere & Wynne
Dallas

Issue: Whether Alpine may be regarded as a seller for direct sales made in Texas by independent dealers and whether holding Alpine liable for sales tax violates the commerce clause, due process or equal protection.

Status: Trial held 07/28/03. Summary Judgment, including counter-claim, granted for Comptroller 07/18/03. Final judgment entered 08/15/03. Motion for new trial filed 08/18/03. Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal filed 10/20/03. Appellant's brief filed 02/02/04. Appellees' brief filed 04/02/04. Oral Argument held 04/14/04. Third COA affirmed District Court's Judgment 07/15/04. Petition for Review filed in Tx. Supreme Court 09/29/04. Response filed by Respondents 11/18/04. Petitioner's reply brief filed 12/06/04. On 12/17/04 Court requested briefs on the merits. Petitioner's brief filed 01/31/05. Respondents' brief on the merits filed 02/18/05. Petitioner's reply brief on the merits due 03/08/05.

Amerada Hess Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN402614

AG Case #042005314

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 08/13/04

Period: 01/01/90-
12/31/95

Amount: \$44,500.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Blake Hawthorne

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether submersible pumps, motors, separators, couplings and related down hole equipment are exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing exemption. Whether certain benefits of a membership fee cause the fee to be taxable.

Status: Answer filed.

American Oil Change Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-06374

AG Case #991175084

Sales Tax; Protest

Filed: 06/03/99

Period: 1992-1993

Amount: \$467,142.31

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Stahl, Bernal & Davies
Austin

Issue: Whether materials are provided by Plaintiff to its customers in the course of its motor vehicle repairs under lump sum contracts, requiring Plaintiff to pay tax on the cost of materials. If Plaintiff's contracts are lump sum, whether Plaintiff is entitled to credit for tax collected from its customers and remitted to the Comptroller. Whether software services are taxable when the seller of the services contributes rather than sells the software itself. Whether software services are exempt under §151.346 as sales between affiliated entities of previously exempt services. Whether interest should have been waived. Whether any of the above issues result in a denial of equal protection, equal and uniform taxation or due process under the federal and state constitutions.

Status: Discovery in progress. Mediation held 10/15/02. Trial postponed. Case settled.

Anderson Merchandisers Holding, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400421

AG Case #041921966

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 02/11/04

Period: 07/01/94-
03/31/98

Amount: \$28,353.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Natalie McLemore

Mark W. Eidman
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether industrial solid waste removal is exempt as a real property service.

Status: Answer filed.

Apollo Paint & Body Shop, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300886
AG Case #031770605

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 03/19/03 Period: 10/01/91- 09/30/98 Amount: \$285,284.13	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jim Cloudt Tom Tourtellotte Hance Scarborough Wright Woodward & Weisbart Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether plaintiff performed its repairs under lump-sum contracts. Plaintiff also challenges the constitutionality of Rider 11.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial setting of 09/20/04 passed by agreement.

Aramis Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-03527
AG Case #98930349

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 04/03/98 Period: 04/01/90- 03/31/94 Amount: \$291,196	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David E. Cowling Jones Day Dallas
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #0000384
AG Case #001273051

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 02/11/00 Period: 04/01/94- 12/31/97 Amount: \$281,676.36	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David E. Cowling Robert Lochridge Jones Day Dallas
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived.

Status: Discovery in progress.

B&B Gravel Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302323

AG Case #031831712

Sales Tax; Administrative Appeal	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 07/01/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Richard S. Browne
Period: 11/01/95-07/31/99		George D. Gordon
Amount: \$99,094.58		Baggett, Gordon & Deison
		Conroe

Issue: Plaintiff claims that the liability assessed is inconsistent with the ALJ's decision and seeks review under the APA.

Status: Discovery in progress. To be dismissed.

BGK Operating Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301224

AG Case #031786478

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jeff Mullins
Filed: 04/17/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Kal Malik
Period: 01/01/99-07/31/02		Robert N. LeMay
Amount: \$28,407.44		Kane, Russell, Coleman & Logan
		Dallas

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is a lump-sum repairer of motor vehicles who should have paid tax on its purchases of oil and filters. Whether charging tax to the Plaintiff results in unconstitutional double taxation.

Status: Discovery in progress. Plaintiff has made a settlement offer.

Baldry, Ann dba Annie's Housekeeping Services v. Sharp, et al. Cause #95-02389
AG Case #95234990

Sales Tax; Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jeff Mullins
Filed: 2/27/95	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Timothy M. Trickey
Period: 04/01/88- 06/30/92		The Trickey Law Firm Austin
Amount: \$63,588		

Issue: Whether sales tax is due on maid services provided by maids placed by Plaintiff's service but acting as independent contractors. Also, whether Plaintiff relied, to her detriment, on advice from the Comptroller's Office.

Status: Discovery in progress. Motion to Compel passed on 01/06/05.

Bell Bottom Foundation Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-01092
AG Case #991112186

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Filed: 01/29/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Timothy M. Trickey
Period: 01/01/91- 12/31/94		The Trickey Law Firm Austin
Amount: \$81,571.73		

Issue: Whether taxpayer's sub-contract was a separated contract since the general contractor's construction contract was separated.

Status: Case dismissed for want of prosecution 06/17/03. Motion to Reinstate granted.
Negotiating an Agreed Scheduling Order.

Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200525
AG Case #021567755

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 02/15/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Period: 01/01/90- 06/30/93		Stahl, Bernal & Davies Austin
07/01/93-06/30/97		
Amount: \$7,280,079		

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and a declaration that the Comptroller disregarded controlling federal law, violated equal protection or imposed tax on the U.S. government.

Status: Answer filed.

Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN204437

AG Case #041927062

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 12/11/02

Period: 07/01/97-
05/31/02

Amount: \$3,000,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Stahl, Bernal & Davies
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and a declaration that the Comptroller disregarded controlling federal law, violated equal protection or imposed tax on the U.S. government. Plaintiff also seeks recovery of attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Texas, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401955

AG Case #041988023

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 06/21/04

Period: 12/01/88-
05/31/95

Amount: \$3,750,000.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Boeing North America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203340

AG Case #021676804

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 09/13/02		
Period: 01/01/95-12/31/96	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David H. Gilliland
Amount: \$343,487		Clark, Thomas & Winters Austin

Issue: Plaintiff claims a sale for resale exemption on items resold to the federal government. Plaintiff also claims a denial of equal protection and an exemption under §151.3111.

Status: Answer filed.

Boeing North America, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304372

AG Case #031884471

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 11/10/03		
Period: 01/01/95-12/31/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Amount: \$500,000		Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin

Issue: Plaintiff claims a sale for resale exemption on items resold to the federal government. Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Bonart, Richard C., DVM v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400552
AG Case #041928532

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 02/20/04 Period: 01/01/02- 12/31/02 Amount: \$50.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Richard C. Bonart (Pro Se) El Paso
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether microchips implanted in animals are exempt as health care supplies and as a therapeutic appliance or device. Plaintiff also claims a denial of equal and uniform protection.

Status: Answer filed.

Broadcast Satellite International, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN103568
AG Case #011518479

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 10/26/01 Period: 01/01/91- 12/31/97 Amount: \$200,000	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson William E. Bailey Dallas
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's broadcast services are non-taxable information services under §151.0038(a). Whether Plaintiff's services are not taxable telecommunications services under §151.0103(l) or data processing under §151.0035. Whether the sale or use of Plaintiff's services occurred out-of-state. Whether Plaintiff's experts demonstrated that Plaintiff is exempt under federal law. Plaintiff asserts limitations as to part of the liability and also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

C & T Stone Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN002428
AG Case #001344233

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 08/18/00 Period: 04/01/94- 12/31/97 Amount: \$207,454.40	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne William T. Peckham Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes sales tax on its sales of limestone to third parties under §151.311(a). Whether Plaintiff detrimentally relied on advice from the Comptroller's Office. Whether exemption certificates covered some sales that were assessed tax. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to the manufacturing exemption under §151.318(g). Whether penalty and interest should be waived.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial set 09/12/05.

Central Power & Light Co. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #96-11455
AG Case #96602037

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 09/20/96 Period: 07/01/86- 12/31/89 Amount: \$32,788	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins L.G. Skip Smith Clark, Thomas & Winters Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether utility pole replacement services are non-taxable maintenance or taxable repair labor.

Status: Discovery in progress. Inactive.

Chapal Zenray, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN204506
AG Case #031729197

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 12/16/02 Period: 01/01/94- 12/31/97 Amount: \$210,943.91	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Curtis J. Osterloh Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether items such as boxes, foam pads and twist ties are not subject to tax pursuant to Tex. Tax Code §151.011 (f)(2) and Rule 3.346 (c)(1)(c) when purchased by a person who uses the items to secure jewelry for shipment out-of-state.

Status: Discovery in progress. Plaintiff to submit Motion for Summary Judgment.

Chevron Pipe Line Co. and West Texas Gulf Pipe Line Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN304712

AG Case #031899016

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 12/12/03

Period: 07/01/91-
09/30/97

01/01/92-09/30/97

Amount: \$683,979.99
\$220,773.61

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Matthew J. Meese
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether installation of cathodic protection devices was new construction or maintenance. Whether excavation and back-filling were non-taxable unrelated services. Whether pipe replacement and recoating was non-taxable maintenance.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial set 03/23/05.

Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403978

AG Case #042071324

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 12/06/04

Period: 01/01/93-
06/30/96

Amount: \$10,000,000.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether charges of contractors for erecting, maintaining and dismantling scaffolding are exempt from sales and use tax as a non-taxable service, or taxable as rental of tangible personal property.

Status: Answer filed.

Church & Dwight Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN000525
AG Case #001258201

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 01/12/00		
Period: 10/01/90-12/31/93	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Robert C. Alden
Amount: \$64,868.50		Phillip L. Sampson, Jr.
		Bracewell & Patterson
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes use tax on promotional materials shipped from out-of-state. Whether the Comptroller's imposition of use tax is invalid because Plaintiff made no use of the materials in Texas. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid. Whether the tax violates the Commerce and Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution.

Status: Answer filed.

Clinique Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-03533
AG Case #98930330

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 04/03/98		
Period: 04/01/90-03/31/94	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
Amount: \$519,192		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Clinique Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN000376
AG Case #001273069

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 02/11/00		
Period: 04/01/94-03/31/98	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
Amount: \$650,361.82		Robert Lochridge
		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Clinique Services, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500049
AG Case #052085933

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 01/06/05	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 04/01/98- 03/31/02		Maryann E. Landrigan
Amount: \$654,245.96		Jones Day Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived. Plaintiff also claims violation of rights under the Commerce and Due Process Clauses, and right to equal and uniform taxation. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Coastal Refining & Marketing, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-03540
AG Case #98930321

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 04/03/98		
Period: 01/01/89- 06/30/89	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jasper G. Taylor, III
07/01/89-12/31/91		Fulbright & Jaworski Houston
Amount: \$1,635,965		Joe W. Cox Coastal States Management Corp. Houston

Issue: Whether certain work performed by Plaintiff is new construction under a lump sum contract and thus not taxable.

Status: Discovery in progress. Plaintiff has submitted settlement offer.

Cosmair, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302009

AG Case #031816135

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 06/09/03 Period: 07/01/96- 12/31/98 Amount: \$1,322,536.67	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David Cowling Robert Lochridge Jones Day Dallas
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes use tax on items transferred free of charge that are subsequently brought into Texas. Plaintiff specifically challenges whether: 1) "use" includes distribution; 2) use was only out-of-state where control transferred; 3) longstanding policy may be changed; 4) Rule 3.346 does not support tax on promotional materials; 5) use tax applies without title or possession; 6) no consideration for transfer; 7) Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid; 8) tax is bared by Commerce, Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses; and 9) resale exemption applies. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400439

AG Case #041925868

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 02/13/04 Period: 02/01/93- 12/31/96 Amount: \$1,642,267.15	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's purchases of janitorial and building maintenance services being resold under a lease agreement are exempt under the sale for resale exemption. Whether Plaintiff's purchases of mechanical maintenance services were exempt as taxable services purchased in the performance of a real property contract for an exempt entity.

Status: Answer filed.

Dillard's, Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203937
AG Case #021703947

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 10/30/02 Period: 07/01/93- 01/31/96 02/01/96-11/30/96 Amount: \$1,100,000+	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's sewing machines and other property used to alter clothing qualify for the manufacturing exemption. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a refund of tax on packaging supplies, non-taxable services, and industrial solid waste disposal. Whether the Comptroller improperly applied a franchise tax credit to the assessed amount.

Status: Answer filed.

Dillard's Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304838 (Consolidated with *Dillard's, Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Rylander, et al.*, Cause #GN203937)
AG Case #041904590

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 12/23/03 Period: 07/01/93- 01/31/96 02/01/96-11/30/96 Amount: \$1,172,784.29	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's sewing machines and other property used to alter clothing qualify for the manufacturing exemption. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a refund of tax on packaging supplies, non-taxable services, industrial solid waste disposal, and sale for resale items.

Status: Motion to consolidate cases granted 11/23/04. See *Dillard's Inc., aka Dillard Department Stores, Inc., and Dillard Texas Operating Limited Partnership v. Rylander, et al.*, Cause No. GN203937.

DuPont Photomasks, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN303695

#03-04-00822-CV

AG Case #031855117

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 09/12/03

Period: 01/01/96-

10/31/97

Amount: \$299,987.35

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Larry F. York

Susan F. Gusky

York, Keller & Field

Austin

Jennifer K. Patterson

Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's purchase of a cleanroom should have been an exempt sale for resale. Whether the lease of the cleanroom was incidental to the lease of the building in which it was housed and whether Rule 3.294(k)(1) is invalid. Whether the Comptroller's final decision is arbitrary and violates due process, equal and uniform taxation, and equal protection. Whether Rider 11 is unconstitutional as: (1) an amendment to substantive law; (2) a violation of due process, equal protection and open courts; and (3) an unconstitutional taking. Plaintiff seeks attorney's fees and demands a jury trial.

Status: Discovery in progress. Motion for Summary Judgment hearing held 09/23/04. Rule upheld. Both Motions denied. Trial Judgment signed 11/29/04. Notice of Appeal filed by Plaintiff 12/17/04. Appellant's brief due 03/07/05. Appellees' brief due 04/13/05.

EFW, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200906
AG Case #021579578

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 03/19/02

Period: 04/94-03/31/98

Amount: \$123,440.25

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Curtis J. Osterloh
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

ELC Beauty LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Aramis Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203514
AG Case #021681226

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 09/26/02

Period: 01/01/98-
12/31/00

Amount: \$284,508.69

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christopher Jackson

Plaintiff's Counsel:

David Cowling
Robert Lochridge
Jones Day
Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived.

Status: Answer filed.

ELC Beauty, LLC, as Successor-in-Interest to Origins Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500047
AG Case #052085966

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 01/06/05 Period: 03/01/98- 06/30/01 Amount: \$750,946.09	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David Cowling Maryann E. Landrigan Jones Day Dallas
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived. Plaintiff also claims violation of rights under the Commerce and Due Process Clauses, and right to equal and uniform taxation. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

ELC Beauty, LLC, as a Successor-in-Interest to Estee Lauder Services Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500048
AG Case #052085990

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 01/06/05 Period: 07/01/99- 06/30/01 Amount: \$586,255.47	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David Cowling Maryann E. Landrigan Jones Day Dallas
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed. Whether Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) is invalid and whether the Comptroller has authority to change its long-standing policy. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived. Plaintiff also claims violation of rights under the Commerce and Due Process Clauses, and right to equal and uniform taxation. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

E. de la Garza, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN003589
AG Case #0011395316

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 12/15/00 Period: 01/01/93- 12/31/96 Amount: \$83,138.14	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Scott Simmons Rudy de la Garza Brownsville
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether sales of grocery bags and sacks are not taxable when sold to grocery stores who have provided a blanket sale for resale certificate. Plaintiff also complains of audit calculation errors.

Status: Dismissed for Want of Prosecution 06/25/04. Plaintiff filed Motion to Retain 07/08/04. Motion to Reinstate filed 08/29/04; granted 10/04/04. Plaintiff's Partial Motion for Summary Judgment hearing held 11/23/04; denied. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment granted in full 01/21/05. Final judgment being prepared.

Ebrahim, Suleiman S. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500567
AG Case #052113388

Sales Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 02/22/05 Period: 01/01/96- 02/25/02 Amount: \$43,847.15	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Lynn Hamilton Butler Robert L. Spurck Brown McCarroll, LLP Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is liable for sales tax assessed against his father's business. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-03525
AG Case #98930358

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 04/03/98 Period: 01/01/89- 09/30/92 Amount: \$472,225	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David E. Cowling Jones Day Dallas
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed.

Status: Answer filed.

Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-03524
AG Case #98930367

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 04/03/98		
Period: 10/01/92-03/31/96	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
Amount: \$748,773		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed.

Status: Discovery in progress. Non-jury trial set 06/13/05.

Estee Lauder Services, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN101312
AG Case #011439874

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 05/01/01		
Period: 04/01/96-06/30/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
Amount: \$614,814.78		Robert Lochridge
		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether written and other promotional materials incurred use tax when delivered into Texas to retailers. Issue of when and where ownership rights existed.

Status: Answer filed.

Ethicon, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304779

AG Case #041904616

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Filed: 12/18/03		
Period: 01/01/96-12/31/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
01/01/94-12/31/95		Doug Sigel
Amount: \$52,616.94		Scott, Douglass & McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff leased real property not subject to the sales and use tax.

Status: Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment hearing set 11/04/04 was passed.

Settlement negotiations in progress.

F M Express Food Mart, Inc., and Fouad Hanna Mekdessi v. Rylander, et al.

Cause #GN002724

AG Case #001353960

Sales Tax; Injunction	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 09/15/00		
Period: 12/01/90-11/30/97	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Percy L. "Wayne" Isgitt
Amount: \$360,671.05		Law Offices of Percy L. "Wayne" Isgitt, P.C.
		Houston

Issue: Whether Comptroller's "estimated audit" is invalid. Whether Plaintiffs are entitled to an injunction of collection and of cancellation of their sales tax permits. Whether Tax Code §§112.051, 112.052, 112.101 and 112.108 are unconstitutional violations of the open courts provision. Plaintiffs seek a re-audit and a refund of money paid under protest in excess of the re-audited amount.

Status: Discovery in progress. Summary Judgment hearing postponed.

FXI Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN102724

AG Case #011492857

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 08/22/01

Period: 10/01/94-

06/30/98

Amount: \$51,832.31

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jeff Mullins

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Eric Hagenswold

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's boxes and packing materials are exempt as items shipped out-of-state. Whether denial of the exemption violates equal protection.

Status: Discovery in progress. Hearing on Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment held 02/22/05. Summary Judgment granted for State.

Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-02407 (Consolidated with *Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. v. Sharp, et al.* Cause #GN200563)

AG Case #98914152

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 03/05/98

Period: 10/01/90-

04/30/93

Amount: \$328,829

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christine Monzingo

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether prizes awarded by Plaintiff to successful contestants of coin-operated as well as non-coin operated games are purchased for resale. Whether sales tax constitutes double taxation on machines on which occupation tax is paid and on non-coin games, admission to which is taxed. Advertising and sewing services are not taxable.

Status: See *Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. v. Sharp, et al.* Cause #GN200563.

Fiesta Texas Theme Park, Ltd. and San Antonio Theme Park, L.P. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200563
AG Case #021567789

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 02/20/02 Period: 05/01/93- 03/01/96 03/01/96-02/28/98 Amount: \$592,759.97 \$349,933.08	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether prizes awarded by Plaintiff to successful contestants of coin-operated as well as non-coin operated games are purchased for resale. Whether sales tax constitutes double taxation on machines on which occupation tax is paid and on non-coin games, admission to which is taxed. Advertising and sewing services are not taxable. Whether the assessment against Fiesta was outside limitations.

Status: Case settled.

Garza, Lawrence v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-07607
AG Case #981001886

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 07/17/98 Period: 01/01/93- 09/30/95 Amount: \$83,910	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Stephen P. Dillon Lindeman & Dillon Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller used the proper sampling procedure and whether Plaintiff was correctly notified of the procedure to be used.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial setting passed by agreement. Inactive.

General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201322
AG Case #021598057

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 04/22/02		
Period: 09/01/88-11/30/91	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Ira A. Lipstet
Amount: \$7,000,000		Matthew G. Grimmer
		Jenkins & Gilchrist
		Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

General Dynamics Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201323
AG Case #021598073

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 04/22/02		
Period: 12/01/91-02/28/93	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Ira A. Lipstet
Amount: \$4,500,000		Matthew G. Grimmer
		Jenkins & Gilchrist
		Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Gift Box Corp. of America, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN102934
AG Case #011492865

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 09/05/01		
Period: 10/91-03/97	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Ira A. Lipstet
Amount: \$359,929.22		Matthew G. Grimmer
		Jenkins & Gilchrist
		Austin

Issue: Whether additional resale certificates should have been accepted for Plaintiff's sales of boxes and packaging materials.

Status: Plaintiff to make settlement offer.

Graybar Electric Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #97-01795
AG Case #97682966

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 02/13/97 Period: 01/01/88- 12/31/91 Amount: \$107,667	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the sample audit resulted in a correct assessment.

Status: Settlement negotiations in progress.

Grocers Supply-Institutional-Convenience, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause
#GN300904
AG Case #031782931

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 03/20/03 Period: 06/01/95- 05/31/98 Amount: \$79,688.23	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Judy M. Cunningham Attorney at Law Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's purchase of electricity used to lower the temperature of food products is exempt as electricity used in processing.

Status: Answer filed.

H.J. Wilson Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-11574
AG Case #981063332

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 10/13/98		
Period: 07/01/90-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
12/31/93		Jones Day
Amount: \$1,076,019		Dallas

Issue: Whether the purchase of sales catalogs printed out-of-state and shipped to Plaintiff's customers in Texas (at no charge to the customer) incur sales tax.

Status: On hold. Plaintiff filed bankruptcy in Tennessee 03/25/99. Motion to dismiss by court held 05/07/01. Plaintiff filed motion to retain 04/25/01; granted order to retain 08/14/01 on DWOP, again on 07/25/02, and again 01/16/03.

Herndon Marine Products, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #91-14786
AG Case #91164788

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 10/18/91		
Period: 01/01/87 -	Plaintiff's Counsel:	John D. Bell
03/31/90		Wood, Boykin & Wolter
Amount: \$62,465		Corpus Christi

Issue: Whether predominant use of electricity from Plaintiff's meter is exempt. Whether burden of proof in administrative hearing should be clear and convincing evidence or preponderance of the evidence.

Status: Special exceptions and answer filed.

Hollon Oil Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN303895
AG Case #031866668

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 09/30/03		
Period: 01/01/99-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
12/31/02		Stahl, Bernal & Davies
Amount: \$144,937.05		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes sales and use tax on materials which Plaintiff purchased for installation in customers' vehicles. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a credit for sales tax collected from customers for said materials.

Status: Answer filed.

Houston Wire & Cable Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500581
AG Case #052113057

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jeff Mullins
Filed: 02/23/05		
Period: 08/01/97- 12/31/01	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jerry L. Starkey Houston
Amount: \$160,596.03		

Issue: Whether wire, cable and reels purchased, customized and sold to wholesalers as non-returnable are exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing exemption and sale-for-resale exemption.

Status: Answer filed.

JB, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203450
AG Case #021681218

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 09/20/02		
Period: 01/01/93- 08/31/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	W. Stephen Benesh James E. Boice Bracewell & Patterson Austin
Amount: \$1,046,033.09		

Issue: Whether the Comptroller assessed tax on transactions that were sales for resale or on which use tax had already been paid.

Status: Mediation scheduled 03/09/05.

JBS Packing Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN402498
AG Case #042003590

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 08/05/04 Period: 12/01/96- 12/31/99 Amount: \$1,820.48	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Mike Cichowski Port Arthur
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether parts and services for an ice machine, a hydro-blasting machine, and for a steam cleaning machine are exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing exemption.

Status: Settlement offer made. Deposition scheduled 03/17/05.

J.C. Penney Co., Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300883
AG Case #031770613

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 03/19/03 Period: 01/01/91- 03/31/93 Amount: \$951,802.17	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jim Cloudt David Cowling Robert Lochridge Jones Day Dallas
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes use tax on paper, ink and the printing of catalogs printed out-of-state. Whether local use tax in McAllen, Texas applies to Plaintiff's aircraft. Alternatively, whether the printing service is performed outside Texas. Whether a sales and use tax on the catalogs violates the Commerce Clause, due process or equal protection. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorney's fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Jerman Cookie Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN101492
AG Case #011451598

Sales Tax; Refund and Declaratory Judgment Filed: 05/16/01 Period: 12/01/92 through 03/31/97 Amount: \$43,121.45	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Steve M. Williard L. Don Knight Meyer, Knight & Williams Houston
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether plaintiff's sale of cookies and brownies is taxable under Tax Code §151.314 and Comptroller Rule 3.293. Plaintiff also seeks review under the Administrative Procedures Act and the UDJA, and seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Amended Petition filed. Discovery in progress.

Kennedy, Gary G. dba Kennedy's Korner v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN202992

AG Case #021663539

Sales Tax; Declaratory
Judgment

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Filed: 08/22/02

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Gary G. Kennedy
(Pro Se)

Period: N/A

Amount: \$N/A

Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff may enjoin fraud audit subpoena and suspension of his sales and mixed beverage permits.

Status: Counter-claim filed. Taxpayer filed bankruptcy 10/15/03.

Kroger Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403582

AG Case #042058032

Sales Tax; Refund

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jeff Mullins

Filed: 10/28/04

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Judy M. Cunningham
Attorney at Law

Period: 01/01/94-
06/30/97

Amount: \$366,142.79

Austin

Issue: Whether electricity used in a manufacturing process is exempt from sales tax. Whether the manufacturing process used by Plaintiff results in a physical change to tangible personal property being resold.

Status: Answer filed.

LTV Aerospace & Defense Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203321

AG Case #021676770

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 09/13/02

Period: 06/01/86-
08/31/92

Amount: \$8,576,046

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Alan E. Sherman, Esq.
Dallas

Issue: Plaintiff claims a sale for resale exemption on items resold to the federal government. Plaintiff also claims a denial of equal protection and that the incidence of the tax falls on the federal government. Plaintiff claims that the Comptroller violated the commerce clause by failing to follow title-passing regulations and also seeks a declaratory judgment and attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300575

AG Case #031759657

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 02/21/03

Period: 05/01/93-
06/30/96

10/01/91-06/30/96

01/01/90-12/31/92

07/01/91-06/30/96

Amount: \$6,726

\$591,086

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Curtis Osterloh
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether post-mix machines qualify for manufacturing tax exemption. Whether some of the machines also qualify for the sale for resale exemption, because plaintiff received consideration even if not valued in money.

Status: Answer filed.

Laredo Coca-Cola Bottling Co., and Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401379
AG Case #041964941

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 04/30/04 Period: 05/01/93- 06/30/96 10/01/91-06/30/96 01/01/90-12/31/92 07/01/91-06/30/96 Amount: \$18,579.66 \$443,299.77	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Curtis Osterloh Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes sales tax on the purchase of money validators due to the integration of the validators into the final product, the vending machine.

Status: Answer filed.

Laredo Country Club, Inc., A Texas Corp. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-11834
AG Case #981064363

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 10/20/98 Period: 08/1-30/98 Amount: \$2,054	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore John Christian Vinson & Elkins Austin
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether sales tax is due on the portion of country club membership fees designated as "capital improvement fees" and "gratuities."

Status: Dismissed for Want of Prosecution 07/25/02. Reopened, as plaintiff filed a Motion for Reinstatement, granted 10/31/02.

Laredo Pizza, Inc., and Samuel L. Alford, and L & H Pacific, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401507
AG Case #041971482

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 05/12/04 Period: 07/01/92- 08/31/95 Amount: \$34,965.35	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Richard L. Rothfelder Michael C. Falick Rothfelder & Falick, LLP Houston
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether prizes awarded by Plaintiff to successful contestants of amusement machines were purchased for resale and exempt from sales tax. Whether the sale of food, beverage and party packages is taxable as food and beverage or non-taxable as amusement services. Whether assets transferred from one subsidiary to another are exempt from sales tax as an "occasional sale."

Status: Answer filed.

Lee Construction and Maintenance Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-01091
AG Case #991112160

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 01/29/99 Period: 01/01/92- 12/31/95 Amount: \$31,830.47	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Timothy M. Trickey The Trickey Law Firm Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Various issues, including credits for bad debts, tax paid, tax on new construction and tax paid in Louisiana, resale exemptions and waiver of penalty and interest.

Status: Settlement negotiations pending.

Levy, Tara, et al. v. OfficeMax, Inc. and Best Buy Stores, L.P. Cause #GN201252
AG Case #041926635

Sales Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: Period: Amount: \$	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Mark L. Perlmutter C Brooks Schuelke Perlmutter & Schuelke, LLP Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Plaintiff claims a refund for the class of persons who paid sales tax on rebates. Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgment interpreting Texas Tax Code Sections pertaining to cash discounts and exemption from sales tax.

Status: Class-action suit. Comptroller named defendant. Comptroller's Plea to the Jurisdiction and Plaintiffs' Motion for Declaratory Judgment heard 10/19/04. Plea granted. Court requested briefs to address whether any part of case survives. Amended Order dismisses all claims against the Comptroller.

Liaison Resources, L.P., and David S. Claunch v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN202795
AG Case #021663307

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Scott Simmons
Filed: 08/14/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	James F. Martens
Period: 1991-1999		Christina A. Mondrik
Amount: \$136,659.08		James F. Martens & Associates
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs owe tax on computer-related temporary services. Whether the Comptroller improperly assessed tax on items sold out of state or on sales for resale. Plaintiffs also claim a violation of equal protection and seek attorneys' fees.

Status: Case to be settled. Final Judgment being drafted.

Local Neon Co., Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-15042
#03-04-00261-CV
AG Case #001254036

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 12/31/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	James D. Blume
Period: 01/01/88-03/31/95		Jennifer S. Stoddard
Amount: \$34,390.24		Blume & Stoddard
		Dallas
		Judy M. Cunningham
		Attorney at Law
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff was doing business in Texas by delivering and installing its signs that were sold under contract negotiated outside of Texas. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory judgment and attorneys' fees.

Status: Plea to the Jurisdiction granted to State 04/07/04. Notice of Appeal filed 04/29/04. Clerk's Record filed 06/04/04. Appellant's brief filed 07/01/04. Appellees' brief filed 08/02/04. Oral Argument requested. Submitted on Briefs 12/06/04.

Lockheed Martin Corp., as Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. and Loral Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN103525
AG Case #011523446

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 10/24/01
Period: 09/01/92-
11/30/95
Amount: \$2,680,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Curtis J. Osterloh
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Lockheed Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201000
AG Case #021583745

Sales Tax; Refund
Filed: 03/26/02
Period: 03/01/93-
01/31/96
Amount: \$7,000,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Ira A. Lipstet
Matthew G. Grimmer
Jenkins & Gilchrist
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200999

AG Case #021583737

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 03/26/02		
Period: 01/01/96-09/30/97	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Ira A. Lipstet Matthew G. Grimmer Jenkins & Gilchrist Austin
Amount: \$3,500,000		

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Lockheed Martin Corp., Successor to Lockheed Martin Vought Systems Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201725

AG Case #021620414

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 05/23/02		
Period: 12/01/95-06/30/97	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Curtis J. Osterloh Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
Amount: \$1,857,000		

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300420
AG Case #031751118

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 02/10/03

Period: 07/01/97-
07/31/01

Amount: \$2,837,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Lockheed Martin Kelly Aviation Center, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause
#GN400625
AG Case #041928870

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 02/26/04

Period: 01/01/99-
12/31/00

Amount: \$1,025,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

MG Building Materials, Ltd. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301686
AG Case #031802978

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 05/23/03 Period: 01/01/96- 04/30/99 Amount: \$2,015,426.24	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Douglas W. Sanders Elizabeth A. Copeland Jeffrey T. Cullinane Oppenheimer, Blend, Harrison & Tate San Antonio
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's audit was flawed because the Comptroller improperly failed to consider late resale or other exemptions in the sample. Whether the sample methodology and 60-day letter made it impossible for Plaintiff to show that the assessment was wrong. Plaintiff also requests a jury trial.

Status: Discovery in progress. Court denied both cross-motions for partial summary judgment 08/26/04. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel denied 11/18/04. Trial setting of 03/07/05 postponed. Negotiations in progress.

Mars, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401349
AG Case #041965336

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 04/29/04 Period: 01/01/94- 09/30/97 Amount: \$726,024	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg R. Eric Hagenswold Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's purchases of certain equipment and related items are exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing exemption. Whether Plaintiff's purchases of installation labor are exempt as purchases of non-taxable stand-alone installation services.

Status: Answer filed.

Maxus Energy Corp. as Successor in Interest to Maxus Corporate Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN404187
AG Case #052082260

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 12/27/04	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 09/01/95- 12/31/98		Robert Lochridge
Amount: \$1,794,780.29		Jones Day
		Dallas

Issue: Whether items purchased by Plaintiff to be exported outside of the US by a freight consolidator and not invoiced individually are exempt from sales and use tax. Whether the Comptroller's auditing techniques can assess tax on transactions previously audited and non-assessed. Whether Plaintiff "purchased" or "rented" software, and whether services provided to implement the software are taxable. Whether services performed on tangible personal property provided by a third party are exempt from sales and use tax. Plaintiff claims violation of equal and uniform taxation, and due process. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Medaphis Physicians Services Corp. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #94-11610
AG Case #94149390

Sales Tax; Protest and Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 09/16/94	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Garry M. Miles
Period: 05/01/94- 06/30/94		Vinson & Elkins
Amount: \$17,063		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's services are taxable (1) insurance services, (2) debt collection services, or (3) data processing services, and whether Rules 3.330, 3.354, and 3.355 exceed the Comptroller's rule making authority.

Status: Inactive.

Mitchell, Christia Parr v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201330
AG Case #021604541

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 04/22/02 Period: 01/01/95- 12/31/98 Amount: \$160,870.48	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Christia Parr Mitchell (Pro Se) San Antonio
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether plaintiff may recover a sales tax refund for taxes paid by a corporation controlled by her ex-husband when the liability was paid pursuant to orders of the court in which the divorce was granted.

Status: Inactive.

Nachhattar Tejpal Legha Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203398
AG Case #021676812

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 09/18/02 Period: 04/01/97- 07/31/99 Amount: \$15,841	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore James F. Martens James F. Martens & Associates Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Plaintiff claims that the Comptroller wrongfully assessed additional sales tax by misstating Plaintiff's gross taxable receipts and wrongfully failed to entertain Plaintiff's refund claim. Plaintiff also seeks a declaratory judgment and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Motion for Summary Judgment hearing set 04/05/05. Trial set 04/18/05.

Neiman Marcus Group, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #93-10279-A
AG Case #93340549

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 08/26/93 Period: 01/01/87- 03/31/90 Amount: \$1,046,465	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson David E. Cowling Jones Day Dallas
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Plaintiff's customers buy gifts from Plaintiff outside Texas and have the gifts delivered by common carrier to Texas "donees." Should the Comptroller have assessed use tax on these "gift sends." Second Issue: whether tax is due on certain remodeling services. Plaintiff asks for attorneys fees under 42 USC §§1983 and 1988.

Status: Agreed judgment signed 03/11/96 on the gift send issue. An agreed order for severance was signed on 03/11/96 on the remodeling issues and the attorneys' fees. Cause renumbered 93-10279-A. State filed a plea to the jurisdiction on attorneys' fees on 10/06/93.

Neiman Marcus Group, Inc., The v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN102403
AG Case #011478294

Sales Tax; Protest

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Filed: 08/01/01

Period: 04/01/90-
12/31/93

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Amount: \$1,908,969.01

Issue: Whether printing charges for catalogs are not subject to use tax because: (a) the printing services were not used in Texas, (b) the printed catalogs were gifts for which title transferred outside Texas, (c) plaintiff did not have sufficient control to be a Texas user, (d) the statute does not include distribution in the definition of use, (e) no use tax is due under the doctrine of *Morton Bldgs.*, (f) Rule 3.346(b)(3)(A) does not apply or is invalid, and/or (g) Tax Code 151.3111(a) exempts the printing service. Whether photograph retouching is (a) a sale of tangible personal property, or (b) repair, remodeling, maintenance or restoration of tangible personal property, or (c) exempt under Tax Code 151.330(e). Also, whether remodeling contracts were tax included and whether sampling was improper. Plaintiff seeks attorneys fees.

Status: Answer filed.

North American Intelcom, Inc., et al. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #97-05318
AG Case #97733563

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 05/02/97		
Period: 04/01/91-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jasper G. Taylor, III
05/31/95		Fulbright & Jaworski
Amount: \$2,029,180		Houston

Issue: Whether care, custody, and control of Plaintiff's public telephone equipment passed to their customers, so that Plaintiff could buy the equipment tax free for resale.

Status: Inactive.

North Texas Asset Management, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #94-08603
AG Case #94113766

Sales Tax; Declaratory	Asst. AAG Assigned:	James Parsons
Judgment		
Filed: 7/14/94	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Judy M. Cunningham
Period: 05/02/91-		Attorney at Law
12/31/91		Austin
Amount: \$24,307		

Issue: Whether a sale of a business approved by the SBA (which held a lien and received the proceeds) is tantamount to a foreclosure sale so that no successor liability should attach.

Status: Inactive. Parties are involved in informal discussions to resolve or eliminate issues currently in controversy.

Northrop Grumman Systems Corp. (Successor to Northrop Grumman Corp. and Vought Aircraft Co.) v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201344
AG Case #021607155

Sales Tax; Refund &	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Declaratory Judgment		
Filed: 05/01/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Period: 09/01/92-		Stahl, Bernal & Davies
11/30/95		Austin
Amount: \$1,600,000		

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff claims that collection of the tax violates the supremacy clause as a tax on the U.S. government and that the Comptroller violated the constitutional requirements of equal protection and equal taxation by denying the refund claim. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Petrolite Corp. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #91-13885

AG Case #91149840

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 09/27/91 Period: 04/01/84 - 03/31/88 Amount: \$432,105	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne David H. Gilliland Clark, Thomas & Winters Austin
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Resale certificates; taxable maintenance services; taxability of various chemicals and other tangible personal property used in oil well services.

Status: Inactive.

R.H. Salas & Associates, Inc. v. Comptroller Cause #GN403975

AG Case #042071365

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 12/06/04 Period: 08/01/98- 04/30/02 Amount: \$66,543.64	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Diego A. Lopez The Law Offices of Diego A. Lopez San Antonio
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes sales tax on purchased equipment used in the manufacturing of wood and metal products. Whether Plaintiff owes sales tax on electricity used to operate the equipment. Whether Plaintiff was denied due process of law and the right to equal protection of the law. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN101511

#03-02-00346-CV

#03-0416

AG Case #011451606

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 05/17/01

Period: 06/01/89 -
12/31/96

Amount: \$6,000,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Curtis J. Osterloh
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Summary Judgment hearing held 03/05/02. Partial summary judgment for plaintiff signed 03/29/02. Judgment for Raytheon granted 05/15/02. State's Notice of Appeal filed 06/04/02. Appellants' brief filed 09/20/02. Appellee's brief filed 10/18/02. Appellants' reply brief filed 11/07/02. Oral argument completed 12/04/02. Comptroller's post-submission brief filed 12/15/02. Trial court affirmed, in part, remanded, in part, 01/30/03. Motion for Rehearing and Motion for En Banc Reconsideration filed by State 03/17/03; denied 03/27/03. Petition for Review filed by State 05/12/03. Response filed 05/20/03 by Raytheon. Reply filed by State 05/30/03. Petition for Review denied 08/28/03. Motion for Rehearing filed by State 09/12/03; denied 10/24/03. Final order of the Supreme Court sent to Court of Appeals 12/09/03. Case is in discovery on remand. State's Motion for Summary Judgment granted 06/03/04. Raytheon's Motion for Summary Judgment denied 06/08/04. Order ruling that case is not final setting deadline for status report signed 06/28/04. State's Report filed 07/16/04. Judgment hearing on 10/04/04 passed to consider settlement.

Raytheon Co., as Successor in Interest to Raytheon Training, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201022
AG Case #021588694

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 03/28/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Period: 08/01/88 - 05/31/97		Scott, Douglass & McConnico
Amount: \$2,500,000.00		Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon Co. and Daimlerchrysler Corp. as Successors to Central Texas Airborne Systems, Inc., fka Chrysler Technologies Airborne Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302082
AG Case #031816143

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 06/13/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Period: 04/01/89- 12/31/96		Ray Langenberg
Amount: \$228,368		Doug Sigel
		Scott, Douglass & McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon TI Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN303643

AG Case #031853625

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 09/09/03

Period: 07/01/97-

12/31/98

Amount: \$3,500,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Doug Sigel

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN303644

AG Case #031853633

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 09/09/03

Period: 01/01/99-

12/31/02

Amount: \$7,400,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Doug Sigel

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN303645

AG Case #031853641

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 09/09/03

Period: 01/01/97-

12/31/98

Amount: \$4,000,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Doug Sigel

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Raytheon Co., as Successor to Raytheon E-Systems, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN304089

AG Case #031873441

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 10/16/03

Period: 10/01/91-

12/31/96

Amount: \$389,408.28

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Doug Sigel

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Reynolds Metals Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401468

AG Case #041970799

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 05/07/04

Period: 03/01/94-

12/31/00

Amount: \$828,614.08

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Mark W. Eidman

Ray Langenberg

Eric Hagenswold

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether conveyors and weigh-ometers are exempt as manufacturing equipment or taxable as intraplant transportation. Whether repair and replacement parts for the conveyors are exempt from sales tax as purchases of pollution control equipment used in manufacturing and purchases of environmental repairs. Whether ship unloaders qualify as rolling stock and exempt from sales tax. Plaintiff also claims violation of equal and uniform taxation and equal protection.

Status: Answer filed.

Roadway Express, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN002831

AG Case #001357631

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 09/25/00

Period: 04/01/88-

05/31/92

Amount: \$713,686.05

\$206,053.87

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

David Cowling

Robert Lochridge

Jones Day

Dallas

Issue: Whether various equipment used by the Plaintiff with its trucks is exempt from use tax as tangible personal property sold to a common carrier for use outside the state. Alternatively, whether the equipment had been taxed as vehicle components under the interstate motor carrier tax and could not be taxed as "accessories." Alternatively, whether taxing 100% of the value of the equipment violates the Commerce Clause because of a lack of substantial nexus and of fair apportionment. Whether all tax was paid on Plaintiff's repair and remodeling contracts and capital assets. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Trial setting passed. Discovery in progress.

Robbins & Myers, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301171
AG Case #031786551

Sales Tax; Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jeff Mullins
Filed: 04/11/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Henry Binder
Period: 06/01/95- 07/31/98		Porter & Hedges Houston
Amount: \$23,492.41		

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is required to pay additional tax after the Comptroller's administrative order became final. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to the manufacturing exemption for down-hole drilling equipment and whether completion of Plaintiff's facility was new construction

Status: Answer filed.

Rockwell Collins, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203339
AG Case #021676788

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Filed: 09/13/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David H. Gilliland
Period: 01/01/97- 12/31/98		Clark, Thomas & Winters Austin
Amount: \$591,028.39		

Issue: Plaintiff claims a sale for resale exemption on items resold to the federal government. Plaintiff also claims a denial of equal protection and an exemption under §151.3111.

Status: Answer filed.

Rollins & Rollins Enterprises, Inc. , dba Country Kwik Stop v. Rylander, et al.
Cause #GN202097
AG Case #021640651

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Filed: 06/28/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	William T. Peckham
Period: 08/01/97- 07/31/00		Austin
Amount: \$45,059.74		

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is liable for tax on food sold from its convenience store area.
Whether the Comptroller applied proper percentages for loss and waste.

Status: Answer filed.

Sabine Mining Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401382
AG Case #041964867

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 04/30/04		
Period: 10/01/97-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
09/30/01		Ray Langenberg
Amount: \$905,468.12		Scott, Douglass &
		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether replacement parts and repair services for draglines qualify as manufacturing equipment and exempt from sales tax. Plaintiff claims that the draglines directly make or cause a chemical or physical change to formations, falling within the exempt manufacturing process. Plaintiff also claims violation of equal and uniform taxation, equal rights, equal protection, due course of law and due process.

Status: Answer filed.

San Antonio Spurs, L.L.C. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403429
AG Case #042050401

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 10/15/04		
Period: 06/01/97-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
06/30/00		Curtis Osterloh
Amount: \$913,435.03		Scott, Douglass &
		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether suite rental fees are exempt from sales tax as non-taxable rentals or licenses for the use of real property.

Status: Answer filed.

Schoenborn & Doll Enterprises, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-07605
AG Case #991187592

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 07/01/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Kevin W. Morse
Period: 07/01/95- 05/31/97		Blazier, Christensen & Bigelow
Amount: \$140,936.92		Austin

Issue: Whether the portion of Plaintiff's gym membership fee allocated to aerobic training is included in Plaintiff's taxable amusement services. Whether the Comptroller improperly disregarded the rule addressing non-taxable aerobic and tanning services under the amusement services tax. Whether the Comptroller should have applied its detrimental reliance policy.

Status: Inactive. Plaintiff paid tax under pay-out agreement.

Service Merchandise Co., Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #98-11572
AG Case #981063308

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 10/13/98		
Period: 01/01/92- 12/31/93	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David E. Cowling
Amount: \$413,569		Jones Day Dallas

Issue: Whether the purchase of sales catalogs printed out-of-state and shipped to Plaintiff's customers in Texas (at no charge to the customer) incur sales tax.

Status: On hold. Plaintiff filed bankruptcy in Tennessee on 03/25/99. Motion to dismiss set 05/07/01. Plaintiff filed motion to retain 04/25/01; granted 08/14/01. Motion to dismiss set 07/25/02; granted 01/16/03.

Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203645
AG Case #021686779

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 10/09/02
Period: 07/01/94-
11/30/97
Amount: \$264,355.46

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Stahl, Bernal & Davies
Austin

Martin I. Eisenstein
Kevin J. Beal
Brann & Isaacson
Lewiston, ME

Issue: Whether use tax imposed on catalogs shipped from out-of-state is unlawful because:
(1) plaintiff never used the catalogs in Texas; (2) the tax violates the Commerce Clause;
and, (3) Rule 3.346 is unconstitutional. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and
attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial to be reset.

Sharper Image Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203821
AG Case #021696851

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 10/22/02
Period: 12/01/97-
03/31/01
Amount: \$258,205.20

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Stahl, Bernal & Davies
Austin

Martin I. Eisenstein
Kevin J. Beal
Brann & Isaacson
Lewiston, ME

Issue: Whether use tax imposed on catalogs shipped from out-of-state is unlawful because:
(1) plaintiff never used the catalogs in Texas; (2) the tax violates the Commerce Clause;
and, (3) Rule 3.346 is unconstitutional. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and
attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial to be reset.

Southern Sandblasting and Coatings, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN103910
AG Case #011532355

Sales Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Filed: 11/27/01	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.
Period: 01/01/95- 12/31/98		Stahl, Bernal & Davies Austin
Amount: \$219,219.35 \$47.15		

Issue: Whether items used in vessel repair, such as paint-gun parts, are exempt materials. Whether denial of the exemption violates equal protection. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial set 08/08/05.

Southwest Food Processing & Refrigerated Services, aka Southwest Refrigerated Warehousing Services v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN103390
AG Case #011509668

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 10/15/01		
Period: 01/01/96- 12/31/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	H. Christopher Mott Krafsur Gordon Mott El Paso
Amount: \$188,477.57		

Issue: Whether plaintiff owes tax on electricity used to freeze food items.

Status: Inactive.

Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN402300
AG Case #041998360

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Gene Storie
Filed: 07/22/04		
Period: 06/01/05- 12/31/98	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Curtis J. Osterloh Eric Hagenswold Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
Amount: \$291,516,385.00		

Issue: Whether equipment used to process tangible personal property for ultimate sale is exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing and processing exemption. Whether payphones purchased by Plaintiff to perform taxable telecommunications services qualify for the sale for resale exemption. Whether electricity purchased and resold as an integral part of other tangible personal property and used to perform taxable telecommunications services is exempt from sales tax. Whether stand-alone installation labor provided directly to a customer by a vendor or by a third-party installer is taxable.

Status: Answer filed.

Sprint International Communications, Inc. v. Sharp, et al. Cause #96-14298
AG Case #96637296

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 11/22/96		
Period: 02/01/86-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
01/31/90		Ray Langenberg
Amount: \$1,269,474		Curtis J. Osterloh
		Scott, Douglass &
		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether networking services are taxable as telecommunications services.

Status: Case was set to be Dismissed for Want of Prosecution in March, 2003. Motion to Retain was filed.

Steamatic of Austin, Inc., et al. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200631
AG Case #021567771

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Filed: 02/25/02		
Period: 04/01/91-	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
04/30/94		Ray Langenberg
Amount: \$103,335.27		Scott, Douglass &
		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff is entitled to a tax refund for repairs to tangible personal property on the grounds that such repairs were for casualty losses exempt under the Comptroller's Rule 3.357 and 3.310. Whether the claim is barred by limitations. Whether the Comptroller improperly changed the rule on casualty losses.

Status: Motion for Summary Judgment filed. Response filed. Partial Summary Judgment on limitations granted for Plaintiff 04/07/04.

Summit Photographix, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN001808
AG Case #001323633

Sales Tax; Declaratory
Judgment

Filed: 06/23/00

Period: 01/01/94-
12/31/96

Amount: \$6,532,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Blake Hawthorne

Mark D. Hopkins
Fields & Hopkins
Austin

Hilary Thomas
Kondos & Kondos Law
Offices
Richardson

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is a direct sales company and may be regarded as a retailer for sales made by independent retailers of business start-up kits. Whether the Comptroller's rule defining direct sales organizations violates due process. Whether §151.024 was applied retroactively. Whether the items at issue are not taxable tangible personal property. Whether the Comptroller erred in basing the assessment on the suggested retail price of all issued items. Whether penalty and interest should be waived. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Sysco Food Services of Austin, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400465
AG Case #041925850

Sales Tax; Protest

Filed: 02/17/04

Period: 05/01/98-
04/30/01

Amount: \$92,357.48

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Mark W. Eidman
Curtis Osterloh
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether electricity used to lower the temperature of food products is exempt as electricity used in processing.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Service of Houston, Inc.) v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN100633
AG Case #011420734

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 03/01/01
Period: 01/01/94-
12/31/96
Amount: \$196,492.74

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christopher Jackson

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Judy M. Cunningham
Attorney at Law
Austin

Issue: Whether electricity used to lower the temperature of food products is exempt as electricity used in processing. Whether equipment is exempt for the same reason.

Status: Answer filed.

Sysco Food Services of Houston, L.P. (fka Sysco Food Services of Houston, Inc.) v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302075
AG Case #031816119

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 06/13/03
Period: 07/01/94-
06/30/98
Amount: \$270,401.80

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christopher Jackson

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Judy M. Cunningham
Attorney at Law
Austin

Issue: Whether electricity used to lower the temperature of food products is exempt as electricity used in processing. Whether equipment is exempt for the same reason.

Status: Discovery in progress.

TCCT Real Estate, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-11647
AG Case #991219239

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Declaratory Judgment		
Filed: 10/06/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 10/01/91-		Robert Lochridge
03/31/93		Jones Day
Amount: \$146,484.05		Dallas

Issue: Whether Plaintiff sold electricity for commercial use when it obtained electrical service under a management agreement for another company which used the electricity in manufacturing or processing. Whether the exemption for electricity used in manufacturing requires the purchaser of electricity to be the user. Whether Plaintiff can be held as a seller of electricity in violation of the TPURA. Whether Plaintiff's right to equal and uniform taxation has been violated. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Case to be settled.

TCCT Real Estate, Inc. as Successor to TCC Austin Industrial Overhead v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-11648
AG Case #991219221

Sales Tax; Protest	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Declaratory Judgment		
Filed: 10/05/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	David Cowling
Period: 07/01/89-		Robert Lochridge
12/31/91		Jones Day
Amount: \$479,719.44		Dallas

Issue: Whether Plaintiff sold electricity for commercial use when it obtained electrical service under a management agreement for another company which used the electricity in manufacturing or processing. Whether the exemption for electricity used in manufacturing requires the purchaser of electricity to be the user. Whether Plaintiff can be held as a seller of electricity in violation of the TPURA. Whether Plaintiff's right to equal and uniform taxation has been violated. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Case to be settled.

TDI-Halter, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN100339
AG Case #011409653

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 02/01/01

Period: 01/01/93-
06/30/96

Amount: \$475,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Eric Hagenswold
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether conversion of drilling rigs to self-propelled, deep water rigs is manufacturing under the statute and Comptroller rules. Whether dredging is non-taxable maintenance of real property. Alternatively, whether interest should be waived.

Status: Answer filed.

Telecable Associates, Inc.; Teleservice Corp. of America; Texas Telecable, Inc.; TCA Cable of Amarillo, Inc.; and Texas Community Antennas, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN100705
AG Case #011422482

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 03/07/01

Period: 03/01/93-
12/31/96

Amount: \$400,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Natalie McLemore

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether cable equipment on the customer's premises qualifies for the sale for resale exemption for property used to provide a taxable service.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Texaco, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201543
AG Case #021613625

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 05/10/02 Period: 05/01/87- 12/31/90 Amount: \$157,090.20	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Plaintiff claims that interest should be offset or waived for a period before a refund was made to a subsidiary.

Status: Answer filed.

Texas Gulf, Inc. v. Bullock, et al. Cause #485,228
AG Case #90311185

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 06/05/90 Period: 01/01/85 - 06/30/88 Amount: \$294,000	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Ira A. Lipstet Jenkins & Gilchrist Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Are pipes exempt as manufacturing equipment or taxable as intra plant transportation.

Status: Nothing pending.

Union Carbide Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN000580
AG Case #001261452

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 01/13/00 Period: 01/01/89- 12/31/92 Amount: \$575,857.40	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Curtis Osterloh Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is entitled to an exemption on labor charges for installing floating roofs on tanks at its chemical plant because: (1) the roofs are exempt pollution control equipment, (2) the labor was for non-taxable new construction, or (3) the labor was for remodeling of tangible personal property.

Status: Settlement negotiations pending.

United Space Alliance, LLC v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401174

AG Case #041954488

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 04/14/04

Period: 07/01/99-
07/31/03

Amount: \$975,000

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether title passed to the federal government according to Plaintiff's contracts at the time Plaintiff took possession of the items, thus establishing the sale for resale exemption recognized in *Day & Zimmerman v. Calvert*.

Status: Answer filed.

Val-Pak Franchise Operations, Inc. dba Valpak of Houston v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN300267

AG Case #031746142

Sales Tax; Protest

Filed: 01/28/03

Period: 04/01/95-
12/31/98

Amount: \$734,112.10

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Gene Storie

Plaintiff's Counsel:

James A. Hemphill
Graves, Dougherty,
Hearon & Moody
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff sells non-taxable advertising services. Whether Plaintiff purchases non-taxable proprietary information services. Whether marketing fees are non-taxable membership dues.

Status: Settled.

West Texas Pizza, Limited Partnership v. Sharp, et al. Cause #96-11751
AG Case #96611633

Sales Tax; Protest Filed: 09/27/96 Period: 06/01/88- 06/30/92 Amount: \$35,247	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Richard L. Rothfelder Milissa M. Magee Kirkendall, Isgur & Rothfelder Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether prizes obtained by collecting tickets from amusement machines in a restaurant are “purchased” by the customer as part of the price of the food.

Status: Inactive.

White Swan, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304767
AG Case #041904608

Sales Tax; Refund Filed: 12/18/03 Period: 10/01/93- 12/31/97 Amount: \$415,185.61	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Judy M. Cunningham Attorney at Law Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the purchase of electricity used to lower the temperature of food products is exempt under Tax Code Sections 151.317 and 151.318. Whether the process causes a physical change to the products. Whether the decision of the Comptroller violated the statute and long-standing Comptroller policy.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Williams, Duane Everett v. Comptroller Cause #GN304667
AG Case #031899222

Sales Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 12/10/03 Period: 2002 Amount: \$50,000	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jim Cloudt Michael R. Cooper Salado
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's civil rights were violated by the Comptroller's audit and whether the audit assessment should be set aside for lack of substantial evidence.

Status: Answer filed.

World Fitness Centers, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN201795

AG Case #021626239

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Filed: 05/30/02		
Period: 09/01/94-05/31/98	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Ray Bonilla
Amount: \$273,005.56		Ray, Wood & Bonilla Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff owes sales tax on the discount and reserve amounts of its factored contracts when plaintiff is a cash-basis taxpayer.

Status: Answer filed.

Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN202030

AG Case #021640669

Sales Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 06/24/02		
Period: 08/01/92-02/28/97	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Amount: \$\$333,602.57		Ray Langenberg Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is liable for tax on items temporarily stored in Texas. Whether tax on services purchased by Plaintiff should be reduced to reflect the out-of-state benefit of those services. Whether Plaintiff should get a refund or credit for tax paid on inventory. Whether the Comptroller should be barred from off-setting debts in the period between the filing of Plaintiff's bankruptcy petition and the confirmation of its reorganization plan.

Status: Answer filed.

Zale Delaware, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301725

AG Case #031806045

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 05/27/03

Period: 08/01/92-
02/28/97

Amount: \$1,170,404.64

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Blake Hawthorne

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug Sigel
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is entitled to exemption on items of inventory temporarily stored in-state. Whether tax was improperly assessed on services performed outside the state. Whether installation services on counters and software were readily separable from taxable tangible property. Whether the Comptroller should be enjoined from taking offsets pursuant to Plaintiff's bankruptcy plea.

Status: Answer filed.

Zimmerman Sign Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500612

AG Case #052113065

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 02/28/05

Period: 01/01/95-
04/30/98

Amount: \$105,046.66

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Natalie McLemore

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether certain equipment, machinery, parts, supplies and consumables purchased to manufacture exterior signs are exempt from sales tax under the manufacturing exemption. Whether or not Plaintiff is a "contractor" to qualify for the manufacturing exemption.

Status: Answer filed.

Insurance Tax

Allstate County Mutual Insurance Co.; Allstate Insurance Co.; Allstate Indemnity Co.; Allstate Texas Lloyds; and Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300968
AG Case #031778947

Insurance Premium Tax;	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Protest & Declaratory		
Judgment	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Steven D. Moore
Filed: 03/26/03		Fred B. Werkenthin
Period: 1995-1998		Jackson & Walker
Amount: \$174,386.15		Austin
\$10,529.48		
\$4,013.24		
\$11,858.40		
\$7,306.09		
(Total: \$208,093.27)		

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs owe gross premiums tax on defaulted auto insurance premiums that are not received.

Status: Answer filed.

American Bankers Insurance Co. of Florida, et al. v. Ann Richards, et al. Cause #396,975
AG Case #861483X

Gross Premium Tax;	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Gene Storie
Protest & Declaratory		
Judgment	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Fred B. Werkenthin
Filed: 05/08/86		Steve Moore
Period: 1985-1988		Jackson & Walker
Amount: \$1,745,569.00		Austin

Issue: Whether Tex. Ins. Code art. 4.10 unconstitutionally discriminates against foreign property and casualty companies by basing the premium tax rate on their percentage of Texas investments (equal protection). (Pleadings refer to art. 4.10, but protest letters refer to arts. 4.11 and 21.46.) Also seeks recovery and attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983.

Status: Inactive. To be dismissed.

American Fidelity Assurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN302070

AG Case #031816564

Insurance Premium Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christine Monzingo
Filed: 06/12/03	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Michael W. Jones
Period: 1992		Kevin F. Lee
Amount: \$241,625.20		Thompson, Coe, Cousins & Irons Austin

Issue: Whether investments in "Fannie Mae" and "Freddie Mac" mortgage pools qualify as investments in Texas mortgages. Whether Rule 3.809 (c) is invalid.

Status: Answer filed.

American International Specialty Lines Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause

#GN002666 (Consolidated with *Lexington Insurance Co. and Landmark Insurance Co.*

v. Rylander, et al., Cause #GN100569)

AG Case #001351998

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Gene Storie
Filed: 09/08/00	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Cynthia Hollingsworth
Period: 1995		Curtis L. Frisbie, Jr.
Amount: \$362,975.97		Randy D. Gordon
		Samuel E. Joyner
		Gardere Wynne & Sewell Dallas

Issue: Whether an authorized surplus lines insurer is required to pay unauthorized insurance tax when the Comptroller is unable to verify payment of tax by the agent. Whether the Comptroller wrongfully relied on another hearings decision as precedent. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive and declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: See *Lexington Insurance Co. and Landmark Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al.*, Cause #GN100569.

Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. of Ohio v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN101899

AG Case #011464476

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 06/20/01 Period: 1992-1998 Amount: \$439,074.12	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Stephen L. Phillips Brian C. Newby Julie K. Lane Cantey & Hanger, Roan & Autry Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff, an authorized surplus lines insurer, is liable for unauthorized insurance premiums tax. Whether the Comptroller lacks authority to determine that Plaintiff is an unauthorized insurer, and whether the Texas Department of Insurance is required to make that determination. Whether the Comptroller engaged in selective and improper enforcement. Whether the assessment violates Due Process and the McCarran-Ferguson Act. Alternatively, whether penalty should be waived. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Answer filed.

First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301692

#03-04-00342-CV

AG Case #031806011

Retaliatory Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 05/23/03 Period: 1998 through 2002 Amount: \$1,432,580.76	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Ron K. Eudy Sneed, Vine & Perry Austin Matthew J. Zim Steptoe & Johnson, LLP Washington, D.C.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller properly used “split” premiums in calculating the retaliatory tax of a foreign title insurance company. Whether the Comptroller’s interpretation of the title insurance tax statutes violates the Equal Protection Clause. Whether the Comptroller’s policy change violated Due Process and the APA. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys’ fees.

Status: The State’s motion for summary judgment was granted 05/18/04 and Plaintiff’s was denied. Notice of Appeal filed 06/17/04. Clerk’s Record filed 07/06/04. Supplement Clerk’s Records filed 07/22/04 and 07/29/04. Motion to Consolidate cases granted 07/29/04 (*Old Republic National Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.*, Cause #GN401630). Appellants’ brief filed 08/30/04. Appellees’ brief filed 10/26/04. Reply brief filed by Appellant 11/15/04. Submitted on Oral Argument 01/19/05. Appellees’ Supplemental Brief filed 02/01/05. Appellants’ Supplement Brief filed 02/15/05.

First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401631
AG Case #041976440

Retaliatory Tax; Protest Filed: 05/21/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$1,490,029.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff’s Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Ron K. Eudy Sneed, Vine & Perry Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller properly used “split” premiums in calculating the retaliatory tax of a foreign title insurance company. Whether the Comptroller’s interpretation of the title insurance tax statutes violates the Equal Protection Clause. Whether the Comptroller’s policy change violated Due Process and the APA.

Status: Answer filed.

Lexington Insurance Co., Landmark Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause
#GN100569
#03-03-00169-CV
#04-0429
AG Case #011417896

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 02/22/01 Period: 1992-1995 Amount: \$1,596,196.63 \$36,174.92	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Curtis L. Frisbie, Jr. Cynthia C. Hollingsworth Jeremy Martin Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP Dallas
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether an authorized surplus lines insurer is required to pay unauthorized insurance tax when the Comptroller is unable to verify payment of tax by the agent. Whether the Comptroller wrongfully relied on another hearings decision as precedent. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive and declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Summary Judgment motions held 08/01/02; Summary Judgment granted for insurers. Notice of Appeal filed 03/21/03. Appellants' brief filed 08/15/03. Appellee's brief filed 11/10/03. Appellants' reply brief filed 12/05/03. Oral argument held 01/07/04. Third Court of Appeals reversed and remanded trial court's judgment 02/20/04. Appellees filed Motion for Consideration En Banc and Motion for Rehearing 03/08/04; overruled 03/25/04. Petition for Review filed 06/24/04. Waiver of Response filed 07/06/04. Case forwarded to Court 07/13/04. Response to Petition for Review filed by Respondent 08/26/04. Petitioner's Reply filed 09/17/04. Court requested briefs on the merits. Petitioners' brief filed 11/18/04. Respondents' brief on the merits filed 01/07/05. Amicus Curiae posted 01/18/05. Petitioner's reply brief on the merits filed 01/27/05. Court has requested a reply from Respondents; due 03/17/05.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al. Cause #484,745
AG Case #90304512

Gross Premium Tax; Protest Filed: 05/24/90 Period: 1985-1986 1989-1992 Amount: \$1,848,606	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Fred B. Werkenthin Steve Moore Breck Harrison Jackson & Walker Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether insurance taxes are owed by insurance companies on dividends applied to paid-up additions and renewal premiums.

Status: 9th Amended Petition filed. Settlement discussed, and partial settlement agreed to. Final judgment signed on paid-up additions issue. Renewal premium issue severed and retained on docket. Plaintiffs have made settlement offer on remainder of case.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., et al. v. A.W. Pogue, et al. Cause #484,796
AG Case #90304503

Maintenance Tax; Protest Filed: 05-23-90 Period: 1989-1991 Amount: \$1,616,497	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Fred B. Werkenthin Jackson & Walker Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Tex. Ins. Code art. 21.07-6 is preempted by ERISA.

Status: One Plaintiff has submitted documentation supporting a refund. Case will be concluded in accordance with *NGS v. Barnes*, 998 F.2d 296 (5th Cir. 1993). Severance and final judgment entered for Metropolitan. Awaiting documentation for other Plaintiffs.

Old Republic National Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401630
AG Case #041976416

Retaliatory Tax; Refund Filed: 05/21/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$289,403.85	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Ron K. Eudy Sneed, Vine & Perry Austin
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller properly used “split” premiums in calculating the retaliatory tax of a foreign title insurance company. Whether the Comptroller’s interpretation of the title insurance tax statutes violates the Equal Protection Clause. Whether the Comptroller’s policy change violated Due Process and the APA. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys’ fees.

Status: Answer filed.

Old Republic Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301693
#03-04-003472-CV
(Consolidated with *First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.*, Cause
#GN301692, #03-04-00342-CV)
AG Case #031806029

Retaliatory Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 05/23/03 Period: 2002 Amount: \$219,626.40	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Ron K. Eudy Sneed, Vine & Perry Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller properly used “split” premiums in calculating the retaliatory tax of a foreign title insurance company. Whether the Comptroller’s interpretation of the title insurance tax statutes violates the Equal Protection Clause. Whether the Comptroller’s policy change violated Due Process and the APA. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys’ fees.

Status: The State’s motion for summary judgment was granted 05/17/04 and Plaintiff’s was denied. Notice of Appeal filed 06/17/04; dismissed 07/29/04 due to Motion for Consolidation. See *First American Title Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.*, Cause #GN301692, #03-04-00342-CV.

STP Nuclear Operating Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN301053
AG Case #031808371

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest Filed: 06/11/03 Period: 2002 Amount: \$115,287.80	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Howard P. Newton Rene D. Ruiz Cox Smith Matthews Inc. San Antonio
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the independently procured insurance tax may be collected from a Texas corporation despite the decisions in *Todd Shipyards* and *Dow Chemical*. Whether imposition of the tax violates equal protection or is pre-empted by federal law governing the operation of nuclear plants.

Status: Discovery in progress.

St. Paul Surplus Lines Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN102788

AG Case #011490877

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 08/24/01 Period: 01/01/95- 12/31/98 Amount: \$163,021.27	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Michael W. Jones Kevin F. Lee Thompson, Coe, Cousins & Irons Austin Richard S. Geiger Thompson, Coe, Cousins & Irons Dallas
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff, an eligible surplus lines insurer, is liable for unauthorized insurance tax. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorney's fees.

Status: To be determined by *Lexington Insurance Co., Landmark Insurance Co., et al. v. Strayhorn, et al.*

Universe Life Insurance Co. v. State of Texas Cause #97-05106

#03-98-00110-CV

AG Case #97727302

Insurance Tax; Protest Filed: 04/29/97 Period: 1993 Amount: \$56,958	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Larry Parks Long, Burner, Parks & Sealey Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether plaintiff should be given credit against tax due for examination fees paid to the state in connection with a market conduct examination report ordered by the Texas Department of Insurance. Plaintiff also asks for penalty and interest waiver.

Status: Cross-motions for summary judgment heard 11/12/97. Summary judgment granted for Plaintiff. State appealed. Case submitted without oral argument 07/06/98. Affirmed in part, reversed and remanded in part 03/11/99. State's motion for rehearing denied. Petition for Review filed 06/01/99. Briefs on merits requested by Court. State's brief filed 10/18/99. Petition denied. Case remanded to trial court. To be consolidated with Cause #GN002605, *The Universe Life Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al.* Case settled.

Universe Life Insurance Co., The v. Cornyn, et al. Cause #GN002605
AG Case #001348580

Insurance Premium Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Gene Storie
Filed: 09/01/00	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Larry Parks
Period: 1993 1994		Long, Burner, Parks, McClellan & Delargy
Amount: \$87,288.51 \$426,620.38		Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff should be given credit against tax due for examination fees paid to the state in connection with a market conduct examination report ordered by the Texas Department of Insurance. Plaintiff also asks for penalty and interest waiver.

Status: Comptroller to make partial refund awarded in administrative hearing. Court issued a dismissal notice. Plaintiff filed Motion to Retain. Trial was set 01/18/05. Plaintiff made a settlement offer. Case settled.

Warranty Underwriters Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #99-12271
AG Case #991226739

Insurance Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 10/20/99	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Raymond E. White
Period: 1993-1997 1993-1997		Daniel Micciche
Amount: \$416,462.73 \$214,893.74		Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld
		Austin

Issue: Whether the Comptroller improperly included amounts not received by Plaintiff in Plaintiff's gross premiums tax base. Whether any maintenance tax is payable on Plaintiff's business of home warranty insurance. Whether the Comptroller is bound by the prior actions and determinations of the Texas Department of Insurance. Whether the assessments of tax violate due process and equal taxation. Whether penalty and interest should have been waived.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Other Taxes

Alpine ISD v. Strayhorn Cause #GV402237

AG Case #041999202

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 07/27/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Ray Bonilla Ray, Wood & Bonilla Austin
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by not properly selecting and valuing sample properties. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Armelin, John M. v. City of Houston Cause #200316037

AG Case #042046375

Declaratory Judgment Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 09/10/04 Period: Amount: \$	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Jaqueline I. Leguizamon City of Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether county court fees collected from persons who are not convicted of any criminal offense are constitutional. Plaintiffs seek class action declaratory relief from the Comptroller. Plaintiff also seeks attorney's fees.

Status: Trial to be set 10/10-29/05.

Arnold, Jessamine J., Estate of, Deceased, and Jim Arnold, Jr., Independent Executor v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203255

AG Case #021670484

Inheritance Tax; Protest Filed: 09/09/02	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Christopher Jackson
Period: Amount: \$161,956	Plaintiff's Counsel:	James F. Martens Christina A. Mondrik James F. Martens & Associates Austin

Issue: Whether the IRS erred in increasing the value of the estate's assets and disallowing expenses and gifts.

Status: Answer filed.

Beadles, Joe Haven v. Comptroller Cause #GN500155

AG Case #052100160

Diesel Fuel Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 01/14/05	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Period: Amount: \$1,709,078.44	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Joe Haven Beadles Pro Se Mt. Pleasant

Issue: Plaintiff claims that the State issued a diesel fuel bonded suppliers' permit to Plaintiff without Plaintiff's knowledge, allowing diesel fuel taxes to be assessed against Plaintiff. Plaintiff claims he never purchased or sold diesel fuel. Plaintiff claims the State previously collected the taxes in question from subsidiaries who sold diesel fuel through truck stops. Plaintiff claims these subsidiaries bought the diesel fuel from an oil company which the State, through an "agreement with the oil company," exempted from paying taxes.

Status: Answer filed.

CarMax Auto Superstores, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN400433
AG Case #041921990

Motor Vehicle Sales Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 02/12/04 Period: Amount: \$0.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jim Cloudt Lara L. Reenan Henry Oddo Austin & Fletcher Dallas
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's tax collection and financing activities are legal under the Tax Code, Finance Code and Constitution.

Status: Co-defendant's Motion to Dismiss granted 06/21/04.

Castleberry ISD; Ennis ISD; Canyon ISD; La Porte ISD v. Comptroller Cause #96-08010
AG Case #96599817

Property Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 07/11/96 Period: 1994 Amount: \$ N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Robert Mott Joseph Longoria Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Various issues concerning the validity of the Comptroller's property value study.

Status: Answer and Special Exception filed. Inactive. Settlement reached with Canyon ISD. Only La Porte ISD is now pending. LaPorte ISD has made a settlement offer. Inactive.

Chevron USA, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN304320
AG Case #031880487

Gas Production Tax; Refund & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 11/05/03 Period: 07/01/88- 12/31/90 Amount: \$225,194.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff owes gas production tax on “Order 94 Payments.” Plaintiff also seeks declaratory judgment and attorneys’ fees.

Status: Case settled.

Comfort ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV402302
AG Case #042000315

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 08/02/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Robert Mott Joseph Longoria Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by misapplying burden of proof and not properly selecting and valuing sample properties.

Status: Answer filed.

Commerce ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV402275
AG Case #042000299

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 07/29/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Robert Mott Joseph Longoria Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by misapplying burden of proof and not properly selecting and valuing sample properties.

Status: Answer filed.

ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403149
AG Case #042035626

Gas Production Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 09/22/04	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jamie Nielson
Period: 01/01/95- 11/30/97		Austin
Amount: \$539,224.78		

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's refund claim fell within the statute of limitations deadline once the high-cost gas exemption or reduction was applied. Whether the high-cost gas refund claim involves the same type of tax as the marketing cost deduction claim which was the basis for the Section 111.207(d) tolling.

Status: Answer filed.

ConocoPhillips Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN500169
AG Case #052091428

Gas Production Tax; Refund	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Filed: 01/18/05	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Period: 01/01/97- 07/31/98		Ray Langenberg
Amount: \$181,161.89		Doug J. Dashiell
		Scott, Douglass & McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's refund claim fell within the statute of limitations deadline once the high-cost gas exemption or reduction was applied. Whether the high-cost gas refund claim involves the same type of tax as the marketing cost deduction claim which was the basis for the Section 111.207(d) tolling.

Status: Answer filed.

Cypress-Fairbanks ISD, et al. v. Troy G. Rountree, et al. Cause #2004-54335
AG Case #042056796

Property Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 09/30/04 Period: Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Walter E. Spears Stephen K. Hamilton Neil H. McLaurin, IV Bartley & Spears, P.C. Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Tax Code §32.05(c), which subordinates the liens of property owners' associations, is unconstitutional.

Status: Answer filed.

El Paso Natural Gas Co. v. Sharp Cause #91-6309
AG Case #9178237

Gas Production Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 05/06/91 Period: 01/01/87 - 12/31/87 Amount: \$3,054,480.60	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Alfred H. Ebert, Jr. Andrews & Kurth Houston
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Comptroller should have granted Plaintiff a hearing on penalty waiver and related issues.

Status: State's Plea in Abatement granted pending outcome of administrative hearing on audit liability. Negotiations pending.

Fort Worth's PR's, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN200711
AG Case #021573480

Mixed Beverage Gross Receipts Tax; Protest & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 03/04/02 Period: 03/01/99- 06/30/99 Amount: \$36,177.36	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins John L. Gamboa Acuff, Gamboa & White Fort Worth
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller used a non-representative sample to determine plaintiff's tax liability. Whether depletion and error rates were calculated correctly.

Status: Discovery extended until 05/15/05. Plea to the Jurisdiction and Motion for Summary Judgment withdrawn. Settlement negotiations being discussed.

Gilani, Fred v. Progressive Amusement, Inc., Craig Byler and Comptroller Cause #2004-10090-16
AG Case #041948720

Property Tax; Injunction & Declaratory Judgment Filed: 03/30/04 Period: Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jeff Mullins Stephen D. Stephens Lewisville
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's claim of complying with contract terms results in ownership of personal property. Whether the defendants' enforcement actions are arbitrary. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and a temporary restraining order.

Status: A non-suit has been filed.

Glen Rose ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV402292
AG Case #042000307

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 07/30/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Natalie McLemore Robert Mott Joseph Longoria Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott Houston
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by misapplying burden of proof and not properly selecting and valuing sample properties.

Status: Answer filed.

Greenville ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV402276

AG Case #041999350

Property Tax;
Administrative Appeal

Filed: 07/29/04

Period: 2003

Amount: \$N/A

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Robert Mott
Perdue, Brandon, Fielder,
Collins & Mott
Houston

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by misapplying burden of proof and not properly selecting and valuing sample properties. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Answer filed.

Harris County, et al. v. John W. Adams, et al. Cause #2004-54306

AG Case #042056804

Property Tax;
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 09/30/04

Period:

Amount: \$N/A

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Natalie McLemore

Walter E. Spears
Stephen K. Hamilton
Neil H. McLaurin, IV
Bartley & Spears, P.C.
Houston

Issue: Whether Tax Code §32.05(c), which subordinates the liens of property owners' associations, is unconstitutional.

Status: Answer filed.

Lake Austin Spa Investors, Ltd. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN203899

AG Case #021703913

Hotel Occupancy Tax;
Protest, Injunction &
Declaratory Judgment
Filed: 10/28/02
Period: 03/01/97-
11/30/00
12/01/00-03/31/02
Amount: \$193,629.45
\$59,232.72

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Natalie McLemore

Kirk R. Manning
Stephen L. Phillips
Julie K. Lane
Cantey & Hanger
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's service charges are subject to the hotel tax. Whether the charges are gratuities under the Comptroller's rule. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Discussions in progress with opposing counsel.

MFC Finance Co. of Texas v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN002653
AG Case #001352632

Motor Vehicle Sales Tax;
Refund
Filed: 09/07/00
Period: 01/01/96-
12/31/98
Amount: \$5,533,079.80

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Jim Cloudt

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff is entitled to tax credit and refund as provided under the sales tax bad debt statute for motor vehicle taxes on installment sales where the purchaser defaulted. Whether the refusal to allow a refund violates equal taxation because there is no rational basis to treat installment sellers of vehicles differently than vehicle renters and other retailers.

Status: Trial setting passed. Discovery in progress. Plaintiff filed Motion for Partial Summary Judgment 03/03/05.

Marathon ISD v. Strayhorn Cause #GV402238

AG Case #041999236

Property Tax;
Administrative Appeal

Filed: 07/27/04

Period: 2003

Amount: \$N/A

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Natalie McLemore

Ray Bonilla

Ray, Wood & Bonilla

Austin

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by not properly selecting and valuing sample properties. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Discovery in progress.

McLane Co., Inc. and McLane Foodservice-Lubbock, Inc. v. Rylander, et al.

Cause #GN104253

#03-03-00502-CV

#04-1066

AG Case #021547393

Protest Tax; Protest,
Injunction & Declaratory
Judgment

Filed:

Period:

Amount: \$1,173.83 &
\$3,690.00

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Gene Storie

Gilbert J. Bernal, Jr.

David J. Sewell

Stahl, Bernal & Davies

Austin

Issue: Whether the Comptroller must accept a letter of credit as security for Plaintiff's participation in the cigarette tax trust fund.

Status: Summary Judgment hearing held 07/30/03. Pleas to the jurisdiction granted in part and Summary Judgment granted for the Comptroller. McLane filed Notice of Appeal 08/19/03. Appellants' brief filed 01/15/04. Appellees' brief filed 03/16/04. Submitted on Oral Argument 04/07/04. On 10/14/04 the Court of Appeals affirmed in part and dismisses entire case for lack of jurisdiction. McLane filed a Petition for Review in the Texas Supreme Court 11/29/04. Response to Petition for Review waived 12/08/04. Case forwarded to Court 12/14/04. On 01/11/05 Court requested response to the Petition for Review. Respondents' response filed 02/10/05. Petitioners' reply filed 02/24/05.

Mirage Real Estate, Inc., et al. v. Richard Durbin, et al. Cause #92-16485
AG Case #92190294

Alcoholic Beverage	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Gross Receipts Tax;		
Declaratory Judgment	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Jim Mattox
Filed: 12/03/92		Lowell Lasley
Period:		Michael D. Mosher
Amount: \$		Paris

Issue: Whether the TABC and Comptroller were allowed to use inventory depletions analysis to determine amount of gross receipts tax owed. Plaintiffs seek class certification.

Status: Answer filed. Inactive.

Petro Express Management, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN204123
AG Case #021705918

Fuels Tax; Injunction and	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Blake Hawthorne
Declaratory Judgment		
Filed: 11/14/02	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Donald H. Grissom
Period: 2002		Grissom & Thompson
Amount: \$450,000		Austin

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's collection actions are arbitrary, contrary to statute, and unconstitutional. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and a return of seized property.

Status: Temporary Restraining Order denied. Inactive.

Preston Motors by George L. Preston, Owner v. Sharp, et al. Cause #91-11987
AG Case #91133170

Motor Vehicle Tax;	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Jim Cloudt
Protest		
Filed: 08/26/91	Plaintiff's Counsel:	George L. Preston
Period: 12/01/86 -		Paris
09/30/89		
Amount: \$21,796		

Issue: Whether motor vehicle tax should fall on dealer/seller rather than the purchaser under §152.044. Related constitutional issues.

Status: Inactive.

Quinlan ISD v. Strayhorn Cause #GV402239
AG Case #041999251

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 07/27/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Ray Bonilla Ray, Wood & Bonilla Austin
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by not properly selecting and valuing sample properties and whether the Comptroller failed to consider local modifiers, sales and market information. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Discovery in progress.

Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, L.L.C. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN204124
AG Case #021705900

Fuels Tax; Declaratory Judgment & Injunction Filed: 11/14/02 Period: Amount: \$115,000.00	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Donald H. Grissom Grissom & Thompson Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether fuels tax is actually owed by an unrelated company. Whether the Comptroller abused its discretion and violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights. Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief.

Status: Temporary Restraining Order denied. Inactive.

Ranger Fuels & Maintenance, Inc., L.L.C. v. Alon USA, LP Cause #3-03CV1535D
AG Case #042049338

Fuels Tax; Subpoena Filed: 10/06/04 Period: 01/01/02 to Present Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Robert J. Clary Owens, Clary & Aiken, LLP Dallas
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Creditor seeks tax and communication information.

Status: Answer filed.

Robinson, Barbara Cooke, Estate of v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300338
AG Case #031758915

Declaratory Judgment Tax; Declaratory Judgment Filed: 02/03/03 Period: 1990 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Arne M. Ray Houston
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller's lien should be nullified as expired or invalid on its face.

Status: Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment and Defendant's Plea to the Jurisdiction
filed 02/13/04. Settlement negotiations being discussed.

San Vicente ISD v. Strayhorn Cause #GV402240
AG Case #041999194

Property Tax; Administrative Appeal Filed: 07/27/04 Period: 2003 Amount: \$N/A	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christopher Jackson Ray Bonilla Ray, Wood & Bonilla Austin
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by not properly selecting and valuing sample properties. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Discovery in progress.

State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN401383

AG Case #041964826

Hotel Occupancy	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Gene Storie
Motor Vehicle Tax;		
Refund	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Filed: 04/30/04		Ray Langenberg
Period: 12/01/97-		R. Eric Hagenswold
08/31/01		Scott, Douglass &
Amount: \$2,000,000.00		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiffs are exempt from hotel occupancy and motor vehicle sales taxes because of Tex. Ins. Code arts. 4.10 and 4.11. Plaintiff also claims violation of equal and uniform taxation, equal rights and protection, due course of law and process.

Status: Answer filed.

Texaco Exploration & Production, Inc. Cause #GN400440

AG Case #041925843

Gas Production Tax;	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Refund		
Filed: 02/13/04	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman
Period: 01/01/97-		Ray Langenberg
05/31/02		Matthew J. Meese
Amount: \$456,608.80		Scott, Douglass &
		McConnico
		Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff's initial refund claim, still pending administrative review at the time of filing a second claim, fell within the statute of limitations deadline.

Status: Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Judgment 02/02/05.

Texas RSA 15B2 Limited Partnership v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN403954
AG Case #042073783

Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund (TIF)	Asst. AAG Assigned:	Natalie McLemore
Tax; Protest Filed: 12/03/04 Period: 02/01/99- 10/31/02 Amount: \$293,223.67	Plaintiff's Counsel:	Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Doug Sigel Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin

Issue: Whether TIF charges which Plaintiff passed on and collected from its customers are allowable reimbursements as TIF assessment. Whether Plaintiff is liable for “interest on the amount collected” or “accrued” interest on the amount collected.

Status: Discovery in progress.

That's Entertainment - San Antonio, LLC dba Park Place v. Strayhorn, et al.
Cause #GN400781
AG Case #041937228

Mixed Beverage Gross Receipts Tax; Protest Filed: 03/09/04 Period: 05/01/96- 09/30/98 Amount: \$211,145.65	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Blake Hawthorne Curtis J. Osterloh Matthew J. Meese Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether door charges should be taxed by both the mixed beverage gross receipts tax and sales tax. Plaintiff claims that the application of both taxes is in violation of equal and uniform taxation, and equal protection under the law. Plaintiff also claims violation of due process and the commerce clause.

Status: Discovery in progress. Trial set 06/15/05.

Willow Creek Resources, Inc. v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN303805

#03-04-00629

AG Case #031859812

Gas Production Tax;
Refund

Filed: 09/23/03

Period: 01/01/97-
12/31/99

Amount: \$1,160,682.81

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Blake Hawthorne

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Doug J. Dashiell
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether plaintiff is entitled to a natural gas production tax refund on gas which plaintiff claims qualifies for the exemption for high cost gas under §201.057.

Status: Summary Judgment granted for Plaintiff 06/15/04. Notice of Appeal filed by State 10/12/04. Appellant's brief filed 11/09/04. Appellees' brief filed 12/09/04. Appellants' reply brief filed 01/12/05. Submitted on Oral Argument 02/02/05.

Yantis ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV402274

AG Case #041999244

Property Tax;
Administrative Appeal

Filed: 07/29/04

Period: 2003

Amount: \$N/A

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Robert Mott
Perdue, Brandon, Fielder,
Collins & Mott
Houston

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by misapplying burden of proof and not properly selecting and valuing sample properties. Whether the Comptroller's order on the value study is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Status: Answer filed.

Closed Cases

Chaparral Steel Co. and Chaparral Steel Midlothian, L.P. v. Strayhorn, et al.

Cause #GN403208

AG Case #042040154

Sales Tax; Refund

Filed: 09/27/04

Period: 10/01/93-
02/28/97

03/01/97-10/31/97

Amount: \$569,549.24

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Christopher Jackson

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman
Ray Langenberg
Scott, Douglass &
McConnico
Austin

Issue: Whether the following items and services are exempt from sales tax: certain property Plaintiff purchased and used or consumed during manufacturing; certain services performed on exempt property; third party installation services; contracted services by the Plaintiff; wrapping and packaging used to complete the manufacturing process; maintenance on real property; items with a useful life of six months or less; and items used and consumed in manufacturing.

Status: Non-suited 01/26/05.

LabOne, Inc. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN002190

AG Case #001335645

Sales Tax; Protest &
Declaratory Judgment

Filed: 08/02/00

Period: 1991-1997

Amount: \$520,983.95

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Blake Hawthorne

Plaintiff's Counsel:

James F. Martens
James F. Martens &
Associates
Austin

Issue: Whether Plaintiff has nexus in Texas for tax on performance of lab tests in Kansas. Whether Plaintiff's activities are taxable insurance services in Texas. Whether Plaintiff's services and sales of supplies are exempt by rule and statute. Whether tax on Plaintiff violates due process and equal taxation. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys' fees.

Status: Agreed Judgment signed 01/20/05.

May Department Stores Co., The v. Strayhorn, et al. Cause #GN300583

#03-03-00729-CV

#04-0904

AG Case #031759525

Sales Tax; Refund

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Filed: 02/21/03

Period: 04/01/96-

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Mark W. Eidman

03/31/99

Ray Langenberg

Amount: \$930,000

Doug Sigel

Scott, Douglass &

McConnico

Austin

Issue: Whether printing on bulk paper purchased out-of-state and made into catalogs and circulars is subject to use tax. Whether the essence of the transaction in producing the catalogs is non-taxable labor. Whether "distribution" is included in the use tax.

Status: Summary Judgment granted to Comptroller 10/30/03. Notice of Appeal filed 12/02/03. Appellant's brief filed 01/12/04. Appellees' brief filed 02/17/04. Appellant's reply brief filed 03/08/04. Submitted on Oral Argument 04/28/04. Third COA affirmed District Court's judgment 07/15/04. Motion for Rehearing filed 07/30/04; denied. Substituted Opinion issued 08/26/04, still affirming judgment for Comptroller. Petition for Review filed in Tx. Supreme Court 10/11/04. Conditional waiver of response filed by State 10/13/04. Response to Petition for Review requested by Court 11/03/04. Response filed by Respondent 12/03/04. Petitioner's Reply Brief filed 12/20/04. Petition for Review denied 01/21/05. Motion for Rehearing was due 02/07/05.

RAI Credit Corp. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN003556

AG Case #011395266

Sales Tax; Refund &
Declaratory Judgment

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Jim Cloudt

Filed: 12/12/00

Plaintiff's Counsel:

David Cowling

Period: 01/01/89-

Jones Day

12/31/93

Dallas

Amount: \$297,616.32

Issue: Whether Plaintiff lacks nexus for collection of use tax on accounts receivable that were factored to it. Whether Plaintiff is a “seller” or “retailer” engaged in business in Texas. Whether Plaintiff is liable under §111.016 as a person who received tax. Whether imposition of tax denies equal protection. Plaintiff also seeks declaratory relief and attorneys’ fees.

Status: Discovery in progress. Summary Judgment hearing passed. Agreed Judgment signed 02/17/05.

Security National Insurance Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN001503
AG Case #001310820

Insurance Premium Tax; Protest Filed: 05/23/00 Period: 1995-1998 Amount: \$1,226,220.50	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Gene Storie Jay A. Thompson Thompson, Coe, Cousins & Irons Austin
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether daily negative bank account balances should be adjusted to \$0 to compute the proper percentage of Texas investments for gross premiums tax.

Status: Cross-motion for Summary Judgment filed. MSJ hearing held 12/14/04. Judgment granted 01/24/05 for Plaintiff.

Southern Union Co. v. Rylander, et al. Cause #GN003692
AG Case #011399409

Franchise Tax; Refund Filed: 12/29/00 Period: 1994 Amount: \$549,983	Asst. AAG Assigned: Plaintiff's Counsel:	Christine Monzingo Mark W. Eidman Ray Langenberg Eric Hagenswold Scott, Douglass & McConnico Austin
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Issue: Whether Plaintiff was required to use historical cost as the basis of assets of an acquired corporation. Whether post-retirement benefit obligations are debt. Whether disallowing deduction of post-retirement benefits violates equal protection. Whether Plaintiff may use another method to account for depreciation.

Status: Agreed Judgment signed 01/24/05.

Terlingua Common ISD v. Comptroller Cause #GV302967

AG Case #031833064

Property Tax;
Administrative Appeal
Filed: 07/17/03
Period: 2002
Amount: \$N/A

Asst. AAG Assigned:

Plaintiff's Counsel:

Christopher Jackson

Ray Bonilla
Ray, Wood & Bonilla
Austin

Issue: Whether the Comptroller erred by not properly selecting and valuing sample properties that involved creative financing and by misapplying burden of proof.

Status: Agreed Judgment signed 02/15/05.

Index

- Administrative hearing, 92
 - finality, 60
- Amusement Tax
 - amusement tax v. sales tax, 45
 - business interference, 92
 - coin operated machines and non-coin
 - operated games, 36
 - Fitness & aerobic training services, 62
 - real property services, 62
 - sale for resale, 45
- Assessment
 - conspiracy, 88
 - double taxation, 51
 - export items, 51
 - inconsistency with hearing decision, 19
 - successor liability for tax, 33
- Audit
 - double taxation, 51
 - procedure, 73
 - Software Services, 51
- Business loss carryforward
 - limitations, 5
 - merger, 10, 11
- Catalogs
 - nexus, 63
 - nexus, taxable use, 39, 63, 64
 - printing, 104
 - use tax--printed out of state, 41, 53
- Cigarette Tax Trust Fund
 - security, 95
- Class Action
 - constitutional and statutory requirements, 87
 - sales tax, 45
- Coin operated machines and non-coin operated
 - games
 - amusement tax v. sales tax, 36
- Construction contract
 - lump sum or separated contract, 20, 28
- Country Club fees
 - sales tax, 44
- Credit for Overpaid Tax
 - inventory or bankruptcy, 74
- Creditor
 - payments by distribution, 97
- Data processing, 51
- Debt collection services, 51
- Depreciation
 - straight line or accelerated, 13
- Direct Marketing
 - advertising materials, 72
- Direct Sales
 - Definition and application, 67
 - nexus, 16
- Domestic Insured
 - constitutional limits on tax, 83
- Electricity
 - manufacturing exemption, 42
 - processing, 38, 55, 65, 67, 68, 69, 73
- Estate Values
 - taxable gifts, 88
- Factored Contracts
 - cash-basis accounting, 73
- Financing Lease
 - sample audit, 16
- Food Products
 - convenience store/deli, 61
 - mall vendor, 42
- Fraud Audit, 42
- Games
 - amusement tax v. sales tax, 36
- Gross Premiums
 - defaulted auto policies, 77
 - paid-up additions, 81
 - renewal premiums, 81
 - split premium to agent, 80, 82
- Gross receipts
 - apportionment of accounts receivables
 - receipts, 6
 - apportionment of intangible receipts, 12
 - apportionment of pension reversion gain, 10
 - double taxation, 100
 - interstate telephone charges, 4, 12
 - inventory depletion, 96
 - severance pay and merger expenses, 7
 - shipping from out of state, 12
- Gross Taxable Sales
 - estimated audit, 52
- Health Care Supplies
 - sales tax, 23
- High Cost Gas
 - limitations, 90, 91, 100
- Inaccurate Certification
 - burden of proof, 90, 93
 - sampling method, 87, 95, 97, 98, 101, 106
- Independent contractors
 - maid service, 20
- Installation Labor
 - telecommunications equipment, 65
- Installment Sales
 - vehicle financing, 88

- Insurance services, 51
 - market value estimate, 84
 - out-of-state lab tests, 103
- Insurer Exemption
 - limitations, 99
- Interest Offset
 - refund to subsidiary, 70
- Intracorporeal transportation
 - manufacturing exemption, 71
- Jeopardy Determination
 - business interference, 96
- Joint venture
 - Sales tax credits, 13
- Labor
 - sales tax, 25
- Leased Property
 - gas generation system, 34
- Lien
 - community liability, 52
 - homeowners' associations, 91, 94
 - nullification, 98
- Limitations
 - administrative proceedings, 99
 - subsequent refund claim, 66
- Lump Sum Motor Vehicle Repairs
 - double taxation, 19, 40
 - estimates separated, 18
 - Software Services, 17
- Maid services
 - real property services, 20
- Maintenance
 - utility poles, 24
- Manufacturing Exemption
 - alteration property, 29
 - burden of proof, 55
 - candy manufacturing, 50
 - contractor, 75
 - electricity, 42
 - intracorporeal transportation, 17, 59, 71
 - non-taxable services, 103
 - packaging, 29
 - pipe, 71
 - pollution control, 59
 - post-mix machines, 43
 - rolling stock, 59
 - sale for resale, 29, 40, 65
- Mixed drinks, 100
- Motor Vehicle Property
 - nexus, 60
- Motor Vehicle Seller
 - liability for tax, 96
- New construction
 - drilling rigs, 70
 - labor, 25
 - lump sum or separated contract, 28
 - tax credits, 45
- Nexus
 - accounts receivable, 105
 - catalogs printed out of state, 39, 63
 - delivery and installation of goods, 46
 - promotional materials, 18, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34
 - regional salesman, 9
- Officer and director compensation
 - add-back to surplus, 2, 6
 - significant policy-making authority, 2, 3, 4
- Oil well services, 55
 - manufacturing exemption, 17
- Packaging
 - sale for resale, 38
 - shipment out-of-state, 24, 35
- Penalty
 - waiver, 15, 92
- Pipe
 - manufacturing exemption, 71
- Pipeline Services
 - new construction or maintenance, 25
- Post Production Costs
 - order 94 payments, 89
- Predominant use
 - electricity, 39
- Premiums
 - home warranty insurance, 85
- Prizes
 - amusement tax v. sales tax, 36
 - cost of taxable, 72
- Promotional materials
 - nexus, 18, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34
 - ownership of, 19, 27, 28, 31, 32
- Proof
 - burden in administrative hearing, 39
- Push-down accounting
 - depreciation, 105
 - merger, 5
- Real Property Repair and Remodeling, 53
 - new construction, pollution control, 71
 - vs. maintenance, 24
- Real property service
 - maid service, 20
- Remodeling
 - ships, 64
- Rule making
 - authority of Comptroller, 51
- S Corporation
 - exempt shareholder, 9
- Sale for resale
 - blanket resale certificates, 32
 - cable equipment, 70

- computer software, 15
 - detrimental reliance, 24
 - double taxation, 40
 - federal contractor, 21, 22, 31, 37, 43, 47, 48, 49, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 72
 - incidental lease, 30
 - manufacturing exemption, 40
 - telecommunications equipment, 65
- Sample audits
 - compliance with procedures, 35, 36
 - timely exemption certificates, 50
- Sampling technique
 - validity, 36, 38, 92
- Service Charges
 - gratuities, 94
- Successor liability, 54
 - business interference, 97
- Surplus Lines Insurer
 - unauthorized insurance tax, 78, 79, 81, 83
- Taxable Surplus
 - contra-asset accounts, 5
 - impairment calculation, 5
 - natural gas company, 7
- Taxable Value
 - presumption, 89
- Telecommunication Services
 - accounts receivable, 14
 - liability for tax, 99
 - networking services, 14, 66
 - satellite broadcasting, 23
 - TIF assessment, 99
- Telecommunications equipment
 - transfer of care, custody, and control of equipment, 54
- Temporary Workers
 - computer services, 46
- Texas investments, 77
 - bank balances, 105
 - mortgage pools, 78
- Third Party Administration
 - ERISA, 82
- Throwback Rule
 - P.L. 86-272, 8
- Vending Machine Sales
 - money validators, 44
- Waste Removal
 - real property services, 17